DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 186 392 SP 015 927

AUTHOR Olivarez, Ruben Dario, Ed.
TITLE Programmatic Issues in Teacher Education: The Texas Teacher Corps Experience.
INSTITUTION Texas Univ., Austin. Coll. of Education.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Teacher Corps.
PUB DATE 75
GRANT OEG-0-72-1121(715)
NOTE 98p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Admission Criteria; Change Agents; Decision Making; Educational Objectives; *Governance; Instructional Development; Minority Groups; Needs Assessment; Networks; *Program Development; *Program Implementation; Sociocultural Patterns; *Teacher Evaluation; Teacher Interns; *Teacher Recruitment; Teacher Role
IDENTIFIERS *Teacher Corps; Texas

ABSTRACT

Various aspects of program planning and implementation in the Texas Teacher Corps Network are explored. The following topics are covered: 1) program conceptualization and design; 2) intern and team leader recruitment; 3) Teacher Corps experiences dealing with graduate admission processes and their implications for change; 4) management of Teacher Corps programs; 5) Teacher Corps projects in different sociocultural environments; 6) characteristics of an instructional system for the training of Teacher Corps interns; and 7) problems of effectively assessing teacher competencies. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED186392

SP

PROGRAMMATIC ISSUES IN TEACHER EDUCATION

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

The TEXAS TEACHER CORPS Experience

2

edited by Ruben Darío Olivarez

SP 015 127

PROGRAMMATIC ISSUES IN TEACHER EDUCATION: THE TEXAS TEACHER CORPS EXPERIENCE

Edited by

Ruben Darío Olivarez
The University of Texas
Austin, Texas
1975

MAY 1 1980

3

This document was completed pursuant to a contract with the Office of Education, United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such contracts are encouraged to express freely their professional judgement in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

Grant Number OEG–0–72–1121(715)

© Copyright 1975, U.S. Office of Education.

PREFACE

Since its birth as a provision of the Higher Education Act of 1965, Teacher Corps has been in the educational mainstream of public scrutiny by educators across the country. Its two major goals as written in the legislation . . .

> *to improve the educational opportunities of children from low-income areas . . . and to encourage colleges and universities to broaden their teacher preparation programs . . .*

led to the creation of a teacher training approach which brought together universities, school districts and community representatives to jointly plan and carry out school programs which prepare teachers for work in low socio-economic school settings. The innovative and somewhat controversial characteristic of the Teacher Corps model has stimulated much writing concerning its performance both at the local and national level.

After almost a decade of the "Teacher Corps Experiment" it is evident that its contribution to the field of teacher education can, for the most part, be traced to the pioneering stages of Teacher Corps programs across the country with the opening of new horizons in research dealing with desired teacher behaviors and the questioning of the effectiveness of current teacher training practices. An aspect of this national movement for improved teacher preparation programs is the recent concept of competency-based teacher education and its implied system of accountability. The competency-based teacher education movement in the last five years has set forth an investigative and analytic environment in teacher education programs across the country which has motivated many colleges and universities to reasses existing teacher training programs leading to major curricular revisions. The role of the teacher has been "reconceptualized" and theoretically partitioned into various related functionable components. These components have been further broken down into monolithic networks of desired teacher behaviors. This analytic process has given way to the systemitizing of program planning, implementation and evaluation with precise specification of goals, assumptions and expected outcomes.

Given the operational processes that are set forth in conceptualizing, planning, designing, implementing and evaluating programs, the Texas Teacher Corps Network (Teacher Corps Projects in the State of Texas) has initiated a process of information sharing dealing with the various aspects of program planning and implementation. This undertaking is reflected in this document. It is well recognized by the contributing authors that the material presented herein is merely a beginning of shared programmatic experiences, philosophies and

approaches which have been encountered in the different Teacher Corps projects across the State of Texas.

This document is organized into seven parts. The first part, "Program Conceptualization and Design," describes five major steps of this process: Needs assessment; specification of objectives; design of the program; conceptualization of the instructional system; specification of competencies; and the specification of the instructional system characteristics.

The second part focuses on intern and team leader recruitment objectives and techniques for carrying out both student and staff recruitment efforts.

The third part focuses on Teacher Corps experiences dealing with graduate admission processes and their implications for institutional change. A close look will be given to The University of Texas Teacher Corps graduate admissions experienced during the fifth and seventh cycles.

The fourth part describes several approaches for managing Teacher Corps projects giving importance to the process of collaborative decision-making and particular project organizational patterns, management roles and monitoring systems.

As evidenced in part four of this document, different Teacher Corps program organizational patterns are not uncommon due to, among other factors, urban, rural, or migrant settings where Teacher Corps projects are in operation. The roles of Teacher Corps personnel may vary from one project to another. Therefore part five of this document attempts to set forth some general role descriptions of the personnel that are likely to be encountered in Teacher Corps programs.

The sixth part of this document describes several characteristics of an instructional system for the training of interns. A contrasting of these characteristics between existing projects in the State of Texas is made with appropriate mention of differences in developmental aspects of the instructional program.

The last article of the document provides a clear and up-to-date description of the difficulties that confront us in our attempts to effectively assess teacher competencies.

> *The sine qua non of competency/performance based programs is assessment, research, and evaluation; yet in these areas remain the knottiest problems faced by educators today.*[1]

---

[1]Competency Assessment, Research, and Evaluation. A Report of a National Conference, March 12-15, 1974.

Opinions, strategies and procedures with specific examples related to student competency assessment with knowledge, performance and consequence criterion factors are discussed and presented in detail.

Acknowledgements are in order to the people who made this document possible: Ernest O'Neil, Acting Network Coordinator during the planning stages of this task; and the contributing authors. Originally it was the intent of the Network to include articles from every Texas project, but the work constraints of newly funded 9th Cycle programs made it difficult for written contributions to be finished.

In the spirit of the underlying goals of the Network—sharing and collaboration—we hope that this document will assist others in preparing to undertake similar ventures.

Ruben D. Olivarez
Director
The University of Texas Teacher Corps

April 1975

Contributors:

Sumpter L. Brooks, Director – Texas Southern University Teacher Corps

Dell Felder, Director – University of Houston Teacher Corps

Joseph Jones, Director – Texas Southern University Teacher Corps/ Peace Corps

Ruben D. Olivarez, Director – The University of Texas at Austin Teacher Corps

Thomas E. Ryan, Teacher Corps Liaison – Texas Education Agency

INTRODUCTION

The Summer of 1966 saw the beginning of a new federally funded program designed to improve educational opportunities for children from low income families. Teacher Corps was born in Texas with four programs. The first cycle placed interns from the Rio Grande to the Red River and from the Hill Country to the Arkansas and Louisiana borders. During the ten years from 1966 through 1976, twenty-one projects were funded to prepare teachers in programs especially designed to enable them to improve the learning opportunities of boys and girls with a wide variety of educational needs. These projects placed interns in almost every section of Texas.

It became evident, even in the very early efforts to implement such a program, that many factors influence the learning milieu. Factors within the educational establishments, broad socio-cultural contributions, and familial characteristics must be considered early in the planning stage, as well as federal, state, and local political-governmental policies and guidelines. While the influence of these factors is not new to educators, the nature and goals of the Teacher Corps model bring them into sharp focus.

The Texas Teacher Corps Network, drawing on considerable professional expertise and many years of experience in Teacher Corps program operation, developed this document with the hope that it might be helpful to those already involved in or anyone who might become involved in Teacher Corps programs.

The Network wishes to emphasize that this document is not a "fait accompli" but rather it represents a thoughtful discussion of current program successes and needs based on the reality of daily operations.

Credit for this document goes to the members of the Network both individually and collectively. It is but another evidence of the extra effort so characteristic of everyone involved in Teacher Corps.

Tom Ryan
Texas Education Agency
Teacher Corps Liaison

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
PROGRAM CONCEPTUALIZATION AND DESIGN *Wilford A. Weber*	1
RECRUITMENT *Joseph Jones*	12
MINORITY RECRUITMENT AND ADMISSIONS: THE TEACHER CORPS EXPERIENCE AND ITS IMPLICATIONS FOR INSTITUTIONAL CHANGE *Ruben D. Olivarez*	19
ROLE DESCRIPTIONS OF TEACHER CORPS PERSONNEL *Sumpter L. Brooks*	31
MANAGING TEACHER CORPS PROJECTS *Dell Felder*	44
OPERATION OF THE INSTRUCTIONAL SYSTEM *Wilford A. Weber*	54
THE INSTRUCTIONAL SYSTEM AND ASSESSMENT *Sumpter L. Brooks and Wilford A. Weber*	67

PROGRAM CONCEPTUALIZATION AND DESIGN

Wilford A. Weber

Introduction

Teacher Corps projects are most commonly perceived as programs which prepare preservice teachers to work with low-income, minority children. Thus it is that the training of interns is often seen as the central—if not the sole—task of a project. However, the internship should be viewed as a vehicle for change. That is, a Teacher Corps project is a temporary organization which has as its major purpose institutional change which will improve the educational opportunities of low-income, minority children. Consequently, the internship is best viewed as a catalyst which is intended to facilitate improvement in three institutions—the university, the schools, and the community.

In general terms, then, the purposes of a Teacher Corps project are three-fold: (1) to improve teacher education programs which prepare teachers of low-income, minority children; (2) to improve the quality of instruction experienced by low-income, minority children; and (3) to improve those aspects of the education of low-income, minority children which are influenced by the community. The purpose of this chapter is to briefly describe the processes by which a program having this three-fold intent might be conceptualized and designed. This discussion examines the three major steps in this process: (1) the assessment of institutional needs; (2) the specification of program objectives; and (3) the design of the program.

Needs Assessment

The first—and often neglected—step in the program conceptualization and design process is the assessment of institutional needs. The purpose of the needs assessment is to determine the perceived needs of each of the three institutions in light of the stated philosophy, goals, and objectives of each. The process begins with a very careful analysis of published statements which articulate institutional philosophies, goals, and objectives. It must be noted that published statements regarding community goals and objectives are rarely available. Such statements are best obtained in meetings with community representatives. The following statements are typical of those which are made by school districts, state boards of education, and colleges:

> *To the extent of his needs, interests, and abilities, each pupil should be provided with an environment and the opportunities which encourage him to develop a positive self-image and a sense of concern and responsibility that will motivate him to acquire*

basic skills and learning techniques and thus be prepared to interact with others to make rational decisions in participating meaningfully with a changing society. (From the Statement of Goals of the Houston Independent School District.)

The public schools should help each student to develop his personal knowledge, skills, and competence to the maximum of his capacity, and to learn behavior patterns which will make him a responsible member of society. (From the Goals for Public School Education in Texas.)

To prepare well-qualified personnel for service in educational systems and agencies through both preservice and inservice programs. (From the Objectives of the College of Education of the University of Houston.)

While such statements do tend to be very general in nature, they do help to set broad parameters which help program designers. At the very least these sorts of statements provide three types of guidance: (1) they alert designers to those goals and objectives which two or more of the institutions share in common; (2) they alert designers to those goals and objectives of one institution which are at cross purposes with the goals and objectives of one of the other institutions; and (3) they alert designers to those institutional goals and objectives with which program goals and objectives must not conflict. Additionally, such statements help program designers to begin to sort out those institutional needs which a program might address and to identify—on a somewhat tentative basis—those institutional goals and objectives a program might support.

Here it is important to recognize that the needs assessment process is one in which institutional needs are identified, not one in which the goals and objectives of the program are imposed on those of the institutions. That is, the intent of the project must be to facilitate the achievement of institutional objectives, not to dictate what those objectives should be. In short, the purpose of the project must be to meet existing needs, not to create new ones. Thus it is that the accurate and objective identification of institutional needs is such an important first step in the conceptualization and design process.

An examination of institutional documents and meetings with institution representatives provide the basis for statements concerning institutional needs. Typical of the kinds of statements which are generated by such processes are statements such as those which follow from two Network project planning documents:

The community needs to become aware of the school district programs and general school district operations so as to become further involved in the decision-making process within school and

university educational programs and to develop leaders in the community for educational purposes (University of Texas at Austin–Austin Independent School District, 1974, page 20).

The community needs programs which are fully responsive with regard to the unique intellectual, social, psychological, and physical needs of each child; that is, effective procedures for early need identification through diagnosis and for appropriate support through prescription (University of Houston–Houston Independent School District, 1972, page 12).

The school district needs teachers with skills and capabilities for interacting, diagnosing, decision-making, prescribing, and evaluating in multicultural classroom settings (University of Texas at Austin–Austin Independent School District, 1974, page 9).

The school district needs to accelerate the development and adoption of instructional strategies and curriculum designs which prove effective in meeting the needs of low-income, minority children; that is, to determine through rigorous evaluative procedures those programs and strategies which prove effective and to develop processes for district-wide dissemination and adoption (University of Houston–Houston Independent School District, 1972, page 13).

The university needs an opportunity to further plan and further test a teacher education program that will best prepare prospective teachers for certification for service in multicultural schools (University of Texas at Austin–Austin Independent School District, 1974, page 29).

The college needs to continue to find solutions to the many problems related to the development and operation of both preservice and inservice programs intended to prepare educational personnel–especially teachers–who are effective in helping all children grow to their full intellectual, social, psychological, and physical potential and needs to formalize procedures by which those innovative processes which prove effective in achieving the objectives of the institution are more rapidly integrated into the mainstream programs of teacher education and related areas (University of Houston–Houston Independent School District, 1972, page 15).

As is usually the case, each of the community, school district, and university needs described in the preceding statements is either directly or indirectly related to a single goal–improving the quality of education for children. Thus, the products of the needs assessment make it possible to identify a common goal which can serve as a focus

for all program efforts. This common goal serves to focus and maximize institutional resources which are committed to its achievement. Such statements, then, provide a basis for the generation of program objectives which make more specific the purposes of the program.

Specification of Objectives

Having conducted a needs assessment, the next step in the process is for designers to identify those institutional objectives to which the project is appropriately able to commit itself; that is, to select those institutional goals and objectives which the program will undertake as its goals and objectives. In short, program planners examine institutional needs, goals, and objectives to determine which of these are consistent with the program's focus on the improvement of the educational opportunities experienced by low-income, minority children. The objectives which are selected, then, are not unique to the program but instead reflect the basic directions which the community, school district, and university believe are essential to improving educational opportunities experienced by low-income, minority children. The objectives which are selected, then, are not unique to the program but instead reflect the basic directions which the community, school district, and university believe are essential to improving educational programs for children. Therefore, inasmuch as the program is committed to the achievement of objectives which reflect highly important institutional goals, its efforts are consistent with and supportive of those goals. Thus the program is never at cross purposes with the institutions of which it is a part.

Having identified those institutional objectives to which the program—given federal guidelines and resource realities—is appropriately able to commit and obligate itself, the next step is to identify and select those institutional objectives which the program will undertake as program goals and objectives. For example, designers of the University of Houston—Houston Independent School District program specified the following objective in response to the college's articulated need with regard to preservice and inservice programs which was given earlier as an example of an institutional need statement:

> To collaboratively establish and operate a teacher education program for the training of interns which results in their: demonstrating competency with regard to curriculum design and the personalization of instruction using diagnostic-prescriptive strategies; receiving provisional certification; and receiving masters degrees.

This objective is typical of those found in all Network programs. Such objectives result from the efforts of program designers to give

greater specificity—in light of the programmatic context—to each of those institutional objectives selected. In this way each institutional objective selected was confirmed as a program objective. Having specified the major program objectives in this manner, the next step taken by designers was to give each objective even greater specificity by identifying sub-objectives appropriate to it. The following sub-objectives were generated from the example give above:

To establish and operate a teacher education program for the training of interns which is: competency-based; field-centered; modularized; collaborative and systemic in design and management; well-conceptualized (in terms of the teacher's role as: facilitator of pupil growth, rational decision-maker change agent, designer of curriculum, and personalizer of instruction), and personalized (within the constraints of certification and degree requirements, program duration, and resource availability).

To establish and operate a teacher education program which facilitates the intern's acquisition and demonstration of those teacher competencies which result in effective teaching as determined by pupil learning.

To establish and operate a teacher education program which facilitates the intern's acquisition and demonstration of teacher competencies which result in effective curriculum design processes and products.

To establish and operate a teacher education program which facilitates the intern's acquisition and demonstration of teacher competencies which result in effective personalization of instructional processes and products.

To establish and operate a teacher education program which facilitates the intern's acquisition and demonstration of teacher competencies which result in effective collaboration among instructional team members.

To establish and operate a teacher education program which facilitates the intern's acquisition and demonstration of teacher competencies which result in effective, positive, and productive school/community relationships.

To establish and operate a teacher education program which facilitates the intern's acquisition and demonstration of teacher competencies which result in effective, positive, and productive strategies for change.

To establish and operate procedures which facilitate the monitoring of intern progress and effectiveness as related to entrance competencies and characteristics.

To establish and operate formal, non-punitive exit procedures for interns through the use of clinical supervision support systems.

To establish and operate procedures which facilitate the study of program effectiveness with regard to intern training.

To improve and more fully utilize the formal structures and procedures whereby successful intern training elements are identified, disseminated, adopted, and integrated into preservice programs of the College—both undergraduate and graduate.

Design of the Program

Having conceptualized the purposes of the program and having specified those purposes in the form of objectives and sub-objectives to which the program is committed, the next step is to design the program; that is, to: (1) design those activities which have the potential of bringing about the achievement of those program objectives and sub-objectives; (2) design assessment and evaluation procedures which will provide both formative and summative information regarding the progress and effectiveness of the program with regard to those objectives and sub-objectives; and (3) design a management system which can operationalize the program design so that the program can achieve its objectives and sub-objectives. It is the purpose of other chapters in this document to explore these three issues. However, because it is not discussed elsewhere, conceptualization of the instructional system is briefly examined here.

Conceptualization of the Instructional System

As noted earlier, the internship is generally viewed as the center of Teacher Corps programs for it is this training which is seen as the major vehicle for achieving program objectives. However, the training of interns should be seen as only one component of the program's instructional system for the program may be committed to the training of program staff, university faculty members, team leaders, principals, classroom teachers, community persons, and undergraduate teacher education students. Decisions in this regard result from the conceptualization of a program's instructional system. That conceptualization should build directly from the program's stated objectives and is twofold.

1. Designers of the instructional system—on the basis of the program objectives and the program design—should: (a) identify those persons the system will train; and (b) specify those role-related training objectives—competencies—which those individuals will be expected to acquire and demonstrate as a

result of this training. This process results in a description of the instructional system's "curriculum content."

2. Designers of the instructional system should specify in great detail the operational characteristics of the instructional system; that is, designers should be very clear as to the nature of the instructional system. This process provides a foundation for the design, development, operation, and evaluation of the system.

Specification of Competencies. The specification of competencies should be built on a conceptualized role description; that is, specified in terms of the roles persons assume during the operation of the program—as in the case of program staff members—and/or in terms of those roles persons are expected to play upon the completion of the program—as in the case of interns. The literature (Cooper, Jones, and Weber, 1973; Houston, Dodl, and Weber, 1973; and Johnson and Shearron, 1973) has adequately described these processes within a competency based instructional system context which is quite compatible with the efforts of most Teacher Corps programs. Consequently, little else on this subject is needed here. However, there are several points worthy of mention:

1. Program effectiveness is viewed here as a function of two interrelated factors: (a) effective planning (program conceptualization and design), and (b) competent personnel (persons who know and do their job well). It is a well-conceptualized program which allows persons to fully understand and appreciate their responsibilities and it is a well-conceptualized instructional system (and selection process) which provides those persons with the competence to fulfill those responsibilities. Team leaders are perhaps the best case in point.

2. Role conceptualization and competency specification is best accomplished through collaborative efforts which result in a consciously pluralistic view incorporating a multiplicity of inputs. The experiences of the authors suggest that a very effective team can be one consisting of university instructors and team leaders who operate as peers with the guidance and assistance of a program development specialist and who actively seek input from a broader range of program personnel (interns, community persons, state personnel, teachers, administrators, and colleagues).

3. The generation of competencies from clearly conceptualized role descriptions allows designers to more adequately relate instructional activities to intended outcomes. This results in

"more relevant" instruction and evaluation. And in turn, the trainee is greatly assisted by being aware of the program's expectations within the framework of his personal aspirations; that is, the trainee is better able to link the instruction he experiences to the role to which he aspires. This enhances motivation and learning.

4. The conceptualization process is often time consuming. However, in terms of the benefits to be gained, designers can profit by viewing it as time wisely invested rather than time wasted.

Specification of Instructional System Characteristics. The specification of the instructional system's operational characteristics in advance of program operation is crucial for it is this process—perhaps more than any other—which sets the "rules of the game." Educational research and the experiences of many programs suggest that many problems are avoided when operational expectations are known in advance. Consequently, the operational characteristics of the instructional system should be detailed prior to the initiation of training activities—the rules must be established before the game begins. In this regard, designers face many decisions. But a few are suggested below:

1. Will instruction be competency based? If so, to what extent will the instructional system be competency based? And what will be the program's operational definition of competency based instruction?
2. Will instruction be campus-based, campus-centered, field-centered, or field-based? And what will be the program's operational definition of that alternative it selects?
3. Will instruction be modularized? If so, to what extent will the instructional system be modularized? And what will be the program's operational definition of modular instruction?
4. Will instruction be personalized? If so, to what extent will the instructional system be personalized? And what will be the program's operational definition of personalized instruction?

Obviously, it is both possible and important that designers deal with dozens of questions such as the above examples; these include questions regarding admission procedures; evaluation, grading, and reporting policies; and instructor and support personnel roles. The point is this: it is far easier to deal with these issues prior to instruction for two primary reasons: (1) those who are responsible for operating the program can be more clear as to their responsibilities; and (2) those who are participants in the training can be more aware of

what is expected of them. This knowledge permits both groups to make better personal decisions with regard to the program. Indeed, only such knowledge lets one know what he is "getting into" and permits him to "buy in" or "buy out."

Summary

This chapter has attempted to very briefly describe the need for conceptualization in both program and instructional system design. Those who undertake the design, development, and operation of a Teacher Corps program are faced with a set of complex tasks—and far too little time and money. Consequently, very often the tendency is to give little time to conceptualization. This is particularly the case with regard to the instructional system. Too often development efforts consist of instructors making their courses "competency based" by writing a few instructional objectives—usually behavioral objectives *"a la Mager"*—and putting together a few modules. The result is not a competency based instructional system—or for that matter any kind of instructional system at all—but rather a jigsaw puzzle of rather ill-fitting pieces. The intent here is not to condemn, for the press of time and lack of developmental resources has forced much of this on all who have undertaken such tasks. However, conceptualization of the program and of the instructional system is prerequisite to maximizing program effectiveness. It is clear that the benefits to be gained more than justify the effort.

In this discussion, a Teacher Corps program has been viewed as a temporary organization which has as its major purpose institutional change which is intended to improve the educational opportunities provided low-income, minority children. Thus, program efforts focus primarily on two goals: (1) facilitating the achievement of those institutional objectives which are intended to improve the quality of instruction experienced by children; and (2) facilitating the achievement of institutional objectives which are intended to improve the quality of the professional preparation experienced by preservice and inservice teachers. The internship—the major component of the program's instructional system—is the primary vehicle used to facilitate the achievement of those two sets of institutional objectives.

Therefore, the position taken here has been that those who are responsible for program design, development, and operation should give particular attention to: (1) those conceptualization processes which contribute to the design of the program as a whole; and (2) those conceptualization processes which provide a foundation for the instructional system which is a major component of the total program. Thus, the purpose of this chapter has been to briefly discuss the need for and the nature of conceptualization in the development of the Teacher

Corps program and the instructional system which is a part of that program. Because of the focus of this chapter rather brief attention is given to the first of these processes—conceptualization of the total program—while somewhat greater emphasis is given to the second—conceptualization of the instructional system.

Program conceptualization has been viewed here as an important process which permeates program design efforts. In light of this discussion, the following appears to be a most useful sequence for designing a Teacher Corps program for it consists of a series of tasks which give appropriate attention to the need for program conceptualization. While recognizing that the accomplishment of such tasks tends to be contextual, the sequence presented here does seem both valid and useful.

1. Designers of the program—representatives from the community, school district, teaching profession, college, and state, for example—should agree that the purpose of the program is to bring about institutional change—consistent with institutional objectives—which will significantly improve the educational opportunities of low-income, minority children.

2. Designers should conduct a needs assessment which provides an analysis of the multi-institutional context and determines the needs of each institution in light of its explicit—and implicit—philosophies, goals, and objectives.

3. Designers should identify those institutional objectives to which the program—given federal guidelines and resource realities—is appropriately able to commit and obligate itself; that is, to identify and select those institutional objectives which the program will undertake as program goals and objective.

4. Designers should give greater specificity—in light of the programmatic context—to each of those institutional objectives selected and should confirm each as a program objectives.

5. Designers—having conceptualized the purposes of the program and having specified those purposes in the form of objectives to which the program is committed—should: (a) design activities which have the potential to bring about the achievement of those objectives, (b) design evaluation procedures which will provide formative and summative information regarding the progress of the program with regard to those objectives; and (c) design a management system which can operationalize the program design; that is, manage the program so that it can achieve its objectives.

This very brief description of a program design sequence suggests that conceptualization is vital to the operation of the program. Conceptualization of program purposes and objectives provides a base for

the design, development, and operation of program activities, evaluation, and management. The view here is that the greater the specificity and explicitness of that conceptualization, the greater the likelihood of program success.

References

Cooper, James M., Howard L. Jones, and Wilford A. Weber. "Specifying Teacher Competencies," *Journal of Teacher Education*, 24: 1:17-23, Spring, 1973.

Houston, W. Robert, Norman R. Dodl, and Wilford A. Weber. *Competency Based Teacher Education Program Design: A simulation.* Westfield, Texas: Competency Based Instructional Systems, 1973.

Johnson, Charles E., and Gilbert F. Shearron. 'Specifying Assumptions, Goals and Objectives," *Competency Based Teacher Education: A Systems Approach to Program Design.* Edited by James M. Cooper, Wilford A. Weber, and Charles E. Johnson. Berkeley, California: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1973. Chapter 4, pages 43-56.

RECRUITMENT

Joseph Jones

Introduction

The recruitment of corpsmembers (interns and team leaders) for Teacher Corps projects is an important process which has direct relationship to the success of the project. Thus in recruitment planning and implementation project staff initially set forth the characteristic features sought in the intern and team leader and design recruitment efforts which will most likely yield applications from such persons. While project objectives differ, the basic methods of recruitment are essentially the same. In one project, the Teacher Corps/Peace Corps program of Texas Southern University, the nature of the project objectives, required the use of some recruitment techniques that in some ways, differed from those of other projects.

Thus, in this chapter, attention will be focused on recruitment objectives, planning efforts, implementation techniques and results achieved.

Recruitment Objectives

Recruitment objectives for Teacher Corps projects basically complement program objectives. Thus, some objectives listed by Teacher Corps projects include:

> **Objective 1.0** To recruit and select interns who are perceived as having the potential and commitment to develop those competencies which intern program graduates are expected to demonstrate.
>
> > **Subobjective 1.1** To establish and operate intern recruitment and selection procedures which result in consensus decisions made by Community, School District, and College representatives.
> >
> > **Subobjective 1.2** To establish and operate intern recruitment and selection procedures in which intern roles and responsibilities as related to Program objectives, expectations, and procedures are made explicit to all applicants.
> >
> > **Subobjective 1.3** To establish and operate intern recruitment and selection procedures which emphasize exit and not entrance competencies.

Subobjective 1.4 To establish and operate intern recruitment and selection procedures which result in a desirable ethnic, sex, geographic, experience, age, socio-economic, and personality "mix."

Subobjective 1.5 To establish and operate procedures which facilitate the study of intern progress in the program as related to entrance competencies and characteristics.

Subobjective 1.6 To establish and operate procedures which facilitate the study of program effectiveness with regard to intern recruitment and selection procedures.

Subobjective 1.7 To improve and more fully utilize the formal structures and procedures whereby successful teacher education student recruitment and selection procedures are identified, disseminated, adopted, and integrated into preservice programs of the College—both undergraduate and graduate.

Objective 3.0 To recruit and select team leaders who are perceived as being competent teachers with the potential and commitment to develop and utilize those particular competencies related to the team leader roles and responsibilities in the Program.

Subobjective 3.1 To establish and operate team leader recruitment and selection procedures which result in consensus decision made by Community, School District, and College representatives.

Subobjective 3.2 To establish and operate team leader recruitment and selection procedures in which team leader roles and responsibilities and program goals, expectations, and procedures are made explicit to applicants.

Subobjective 3.3 To establish and operate team leader recruitment and selection procedures which result in the selection of team leaders who are designated as totally acceptable by the respective principals.

Subobjective 3.4 To establish and operate team leader recruitment and selection procedures which result in a desirable ethnic, sex, experience, age, personality, and

leadership potential "mix."

Subobjective 3.5 To establish and operate team leader recruitment and selection procedures which facilitate the monitoring of team leader effectiveness in the Program as related to entrance competencies and characteristics.

Subobjective 3.6 To establish and operate procedures which facilitate the study of program effectiveness with regard to team leader recruitment and selection procedures.

Subobjective 3.7 To improve and more fully utilize the formal structures and procedures whereby successful team leader recruitment and selection processes are identified, disseminated, adopted, and integrated into staff development programs of the School District and teacher education programs of the College—both undergraduate and graduate.

Objective 7.0 To collaboratively recruit and select for positions of leadership in the Program and in the school/community (including the Associate Program Director for the Community and the three School/Community Coordinators) those community persons who are fully informed as to the nature, expectations and objectives of the Program, who are fully committed to the fulfillment of those expectations and the achievement of those objectives, and who possess or have the potential to develop the competencies needed to facilitate that process.

Subobjective 7.1 To continue to operate procedures by which community persons in each school/community more fully understand the nature, expectations and objectives of the Program, especially as these relate to their particular needs and leadership roles.

Subobjective 7.2 To continue to operate procedures by which community persons in each school/community become increasingly committed to, supportive of, and involved in the achievement of the objectives of the Program.

Subobjective 7.3 To establish and operate selection procedures whereby those community persons who are committed to the fulfillment selected for full participation and involvement in positions of leadership within the Program.

Subobjective 7.4 To establish and operate community leadership personnel recruitment and selection procedures which facilitate the monitoring of community leadership personnel effectiveness in the Program as related to entrance competencies and characteristics.

Subobjective 7.5 To establish and operate community leadership personnel recruitment and selection procedures which facilitate the study of program effectiveness with regard to school/community leader recruitment and selection procedures.

Subobjective 7.6 To improve and more fully utilize the formal structures and procedures whereby successful community leadership personnel recruitment and selection processes are identified, disseminated, adopted and integrated into the ongoing programs of the School District and College.

Objective 9.0 To collaboratively recruit and select university faculty members and administrators who are fully informed as to the nature, expectations, and objectives of the Program, who are fully committed to the fulfillment of those expectations and the achievement of those objectives, and who possess or have the potential to develop the competencies needed to facilitate that process.

Subobjective 9.1 To continue to operate procedures by which university faculty members and administrators more fully understand the nature, expectations, and objectives of the Program, especially as these relate to their individual and collective needs.

Subobjective 9.2 To continue to operate procedures by which university faculty and administrators become increasingly committed to, supportive of, and involved in the achievement of the objectives of the Program.

Subobjective 9.3 To establish and operate selection procedures whereby those university personnel who are committed to the fulfillment of the expectations and the achievement of the objectives of the Program are identified and selected for full participation and involvement in various aspects of the program

Subobjective 9.4 To establish and operate university personnel recruitment and selection procedures which facilitate the monitoring of university personnel effectiveness in the program as related to entrance competencies and characteristics.

Subobjective 9.5 To establish and operate university personnel recruitment and selection procedures which facilitate the study of program effectiveness with regard to university personnel recruitment and selection procedures.

Subobjective 9.6 To improve and more fully utilize the formal structures and procedures whereby successful university personnel recruitment and selection processes are identified, disseminated, adopted, and integrated into ongoing staff development programs in the School District and in programs of the College.

The objectives are often stated in broad, general terms but most include:

(1) the selection of corps members who meet the minimum requirements accepted for the planned program and the projected ability of the individual to benefit and contribute to the program's over all effectiveness.

(2) the recruitment of an ethnic mix of corpsmembers corresponding to that of the local school district.

(3) the location of persons from the local area or from a similar urban community in the Southwest.

(4) the recruitment of bilingual (Spanish-English) interns as a major objective of programs involving a substantially large number of spanish speaking children.

One project, a joint Teacher Corps/Peace Corps program, stressed the recruitment of interns who were interested in serving one year in Teacher Corps and two years in Peace Corps in Africa. This same program recruited persons who were bachelor's degree holders in mathematics and science. In this project the recruitment of local persons was not an important factor.

The successful achievement of program goals involves also the recruitment of community volunteers, team leaders and university faculty members who teach special courses. Program objectives to achieve success resulting from the recruitment of such persons are

included in the planning of the project. Such program objectives for one project have been previously listed.

Recruitment Techniques

A successful recruitment effort involves the use of a variety of methods and procedures to identify qualified applicants. The recruitment effort is generally coordinated by a member of the program staff and might include the use of the following techniques for the location of prospective interns:

1. Distribution of brochures to colleges and universities.
2. Contacts with community organizations, teachers and parents.
3. Announcements on radio, television and in the newspapers, especially in those media that cater to minority communities.
4. Visitations to schools, and universities by project staff and selected interns.
5. Contacts with candidates supplied by Teacher Corps Recruitment Centers.
6. Placement of advertisements in student and university publications.

Recruitment Techniques for Community Volunteers

Techniques used to recruit community volunteers did not vary too greatly from those used to locate suitable interns. In order to find volunteers in the community it was necessary to contact community leaders, such as church ministers, social workers, school principals and persons who have been active in community-school affairs. Frequent use of communication media such as local newspapers, radio, church news bulletins and other such devices aid in the process of locating interested persons. Often personal contacts with parents by the community coordinator, team leaders and staff personnel are instrumental in finding community volunteers.

In the recruitment of team leaders, program directors generally work very closely with building principals and with school district personnel officers to advertise team leader positions. In some districts, advertisement is provided through the Superintendents Newsletter which is often circulated weekly. Team leaders already in the program can help apprise interested teachers of the openings and thus assure a large number of applications for the position.

The recruitment of university faculty members to serve in the various projects involves direct contacts with the prospective faculty

participant and with his department head. A primary concern is that of identifying persons who are "fully informed as to the nature, expectations and objectives of the program, and who are committed to the fulfillment of those objectives." In most instances such persons have already participated in some special workshop and other aspects of the program and are interested in a more extensive involvement in it. Department heads are often able to facilitate the recruitment of faculty participants by arranging for them to acquire leave-status for special assignment to the project. Likewise Department heads can help facilitate the recruitment and processing of prospective faculty members from the public schools who wish to acquire visiting faculty status with the program.

Results of Recruitment Efforts

No one recruiting technique alone will suffice as a satisfactory approach to fulfilling recruitment objectives. Moreover, the achievement of such objectives is attained most often if the recruiting begins early in the spring and before prospective applicants have opted for other assignments. In some instances, recruitment objectives have been compromised by a lack of enough lead-time to plan and implement a coordinated recruitment effort. In some cases, a short lead time has resulted because of late notification of project approval by the National Teacher Corps office. Programs that have narrowly defined objectives and those seeking minority applicants in restricted subject matter areas must spend more time and launch recruiting in a more broadly based national arena in order to locate suitable interns. In general most projects have achieved their recruitment objectives prior to the end of the pre-service phase. Persons who are deselected during pre-service can often be replaced by suitable candidates. This has been especially true in recent years as the job market in education, especially in certain fields, has become more constricted.

MINORITY RECRUITMENT AND ADMISSIONS: THE TEACHER CORPS EXPERIENCE AND ITS IMPLICATIONS FOR INSTITUTIONAL CHANGE

Ruben D. Olivarez

Introduction

> *. . . Teacher Corps projects present unique and unusual management problems. Essentially projects are created as sub-systems derived from two or more participating institutions which exert both the guiding and constraining forces of supra-systems. The sub-system, or project must function in harmony with the institutional philosophies and operating policies of the supra-systems, the LEA and IHE. The project is subject to two or more masters, therefore, and Teacher Corps managers must be consciously aware that it is possible for project goals to be suffocated through the competing and sometimes unconscious behavior of parent institutions. The project is free to pursue its mission only to the extent that the philosophies and policies of the LEA and IHE are compatible with it or can be compatibly aligned through negotiation.* (Felder, 1975)

One would find little or no substance in the above statement to argue, question or delete. The unique nature of Teacher Corps is real and because of its uniqueness a multitude of approaches for program implementation can be considered and defined in accordance with the standard operating procedures of the cooperating institutions, Local Education Agencies (LEAs) and Institutes of Higher Education (IHEs).

When considering the possibilities of institutional change occurring as a result of a particular Teacher Corps involvement, several assumptions can be derived from the managerial context description of the program provided by Felder. One would assume that by the mere willingness to embark upon a Teacher Corps venture the participating institution recognizes or directly admits an interest in exploring alternatives to on-going programs. This first step can be seen as a significant indicator favorable to change. In order to "accommodate" a special program such as Teacher Corps, which has characteristics that radically distinguish it from on-going programs, the participating institutions must make some obvious changes in their standard operating procedures. A sub-system, if it is to survive, cannot just be "appended" to two supra-systems. Therefore negotiations need to take place during the conceptualization and development of the program design. However, given the fact that as strong as the design can be, there will arise unanticipated problems during the implementation process that make

the negotiating process an on-going characteristic of the sub-system/ supra-system relationship. The variety of approaches that may be utilized for these negotiations are determined by the personal and professional styles of the Teacher Corps project managers and the unique make-up of the institutional settings. It is in these negotiations that long-lasting or short-lived institutional change impacts are made. The institutionalization of new procedures is dependent on how well the climates or conditions favorable to change are formulated. If approached from a "total picture" standpoint, the two-year life span of a single Teacher Corps project could easily provide volumes of insights into the dynamics of organizational behavior and institutional change strategies.

The purpose of this chapter is to address one area of the Teacher Corps program implementation process that has implications for institutional change. Mention is made about past Teacher Corps experiences with graduate admissions procedures and a close look is given to the admissions process in The University of Texas Teacher Corps Project as experienced in the fifth and seventh Cycles.

Graduate Admissions

The corpsmember admission to the graduate school is an essential procedural step which must be dealt with and clarified before recruitment efforts are started. In the early years of Teacher Corps it was not uncommon to have recruitment efforts conducted and completed by a Teacher Corps staff only to find later that interns were not admitted into the universities because of conflicting selection criteria between the Teacher Corps program and the participating institution. This problem was more evident in graduate level programs since institutional standards for graduate admissions are normally based on undergraduate academic performance determined by grade-point averages (GPA) and/or Graduate Record Examination (GRE) scores. Teacher Corps programs normally propose selection criteria that may not necessarily be exhibited by a candidate's score on a test. Affective criterion factors and other factors relevant to the proposed programs are given high considerations.

> *. . . To establish and operate intern recruitment and selection procedures which result in consensus decisions made by Community, School District, and College representatives . . . To establish and operate intern recruitment and selection procedures in which intern roles and responsibilities as related to Program objectives, expectations, and procedures are made explicit to all applicants . . . To establish and operate intern recruitment and selection procedures which emphasize exit and not entrance competencies . . . To establish and operate intern recruitment and*

selection procedures which result in a desirable ethnic, sex, geographic, experience, age, socio-economic, and personality "mix" . . . To establish and operate procedures which facilitate the study of intern progress in the program as related to entrance competencies and characteristics . . . To establish and operate procedures which facilitate the study of program effectiveness with regard to intern recruitment and selection procedures . . . to improve and more fully utilize the formal structures and procedures whereby successful teacher education student recruitment and selection procedures are identified, disseminated, adopted, and integrated into preservice programs of the College–both undergraduate and graduate. (University of Houston, 1973)

An important factor of this graduate admissions dilemma is one related to the incompatibility of the regular graduate admissions criteria with minority students.

It has long been established that the sole use of standardized test scores has precluded participation of minority students due to the cultural and language biases of the tests used. Since Teacher Corps programs through the years have attempted to attract a high percentage of minority Corpsmen this aspect of the graduate admissions process highlights some implications for institutional change.

Various approaches have been attempted to resolve this problem. One seventh cycle South Texas Teacher Corps program negotiated with the participating institution a selection process that compromised the *entrance* criteria but left the *admission* criteria unchanged. Interns were recruited into a Teacher Corps program by utilizing the Teacher Corps program's criteria and were allowed to undertake graduate coursework. However, if after three trials the selected interns did not attain the institution's desired GRE score, the intern was not allowed to continue as a graduate student. Courswork completed instead was applied for teaching certification credentials. This process was made known to the interns in advance of selection. Formal follow-up studies of this approach were not undertaken; however, the project directors of such programs provided experiential accounts that described the process as futile. For many interns in this kind of program the primary concern became preparing for and attaining the desired GRE score. Thus, Teacher Corps program involvement became of secondary interest and the commitment to the goals of the program was lost in the desperate struggle to obtain institutional acceptance.

Another approach was the utilization of both the institution's and the proposed program's criteria. Besides meeting the university's standard admission criteria the applicant was also screened in accordance with the proposed Teacher Corps program guidelines. Teacher Corps

projects that utilized this approach contained a very low—if any—number of minority students.

The UT Experience

At The University of Texas at Austin the Teacher Corps program has contributed to a changing minority student admissions process. In keeping with the needs and interests of the participating school districts, a large number of minority students were recruited during the fifth and seventh cycles. During these past two cycles involvement with two San Antonio school districts led to the recruitment and selection of sixty-nine corpsmen, fifty-six of whom were minority students. It was found that a high number of minority corpsmember candidates, who possessed characteristics which closely matched the goals of the Teacher Corps program, did not necessarily exhibit high GRE scores and/or high undergraduate grade point averages.

The following is a description of the fifth and seventh cycle recruitment process and corpsmember GRE, GPA and ethnic profiles.

Fifth Cycle. The University of Texas at Austin was initially involved with a Teacher Corps program in July 1970. Jointly with the San Antonio Independent School District, the university submitted a Teacher Corps proposal to the Federal Office of Education and consequently funding was granted for a two-year graduate level 5th Cycle Teacher Corps project (July 1970—May 1972).

Because of an expressed interest by the university and the school district in increasing the number of minority teachers, efforts were made to recruit prospective corpsmembers who were Mexican American or Black.

Due to late funding notification from the Washington Office, recruitment efforts were plagued with severe time constraints. Poorly defined criteria for admission to corpsmember candidacy and to graduate school further contributed to recruitment difficulties. In order to begin the pre-service phase of the corpsmember training on schedule, the recruitment process was accelerated by obtaining assistance from the National Teacher Corps Recruitment Center.

Initially, there were 40 corpsmembers recruited into the program, 34 interns and 6 team leaders. Five other corpsmen were accepted into the program one year later during the project's intervening summer (1971). Four of the late additions were transfers from other Teacher Corps projects, and one was a replacement for a team leader who resigned during the intervening summer.

Thus a total of 45 corpsmembers participated in the Teacher Corps program throughout the period of July 1970 and May 1972. The sex composition of the total corpsmember body was 20 males and

25 females. The corpsmember ethnic breakdown was 7 Blacks, 15 Mexican Americans and 23 Anglos. Ages of corpsmembers ranged from 21 to 48. There were 31 corpsmen that completed the program. Twenty-one corpsmen were recipients of a master of education degree and ten corpsmen, who each wrote a thesis, received a master of arts degree.

Total corpsmen Graduate Record Examination composite scores ranged from 430 to 1380 (See Table 1 at end of chapter). Out of the 20 corpsmen who scored the minimum of 1000 (graduate school normal standard), 18 were Anglo and 2 were Mexican American.

GRE scores for 9 Mexican American corpsmen ranged from 720 to 870. There were 2 Mexican Americans who scored 640 and 630 and 2 who scored 530 and 430 (See Table 2).

There was a wide distribution of GRE scores among the seven Black corpsmen; scores ranged from 480 to 950 (See Table 3).

One Anglo corpsman was deselected during the Spring semester of the first year, but the deselection was not related to academic performance. There were 14 corpsmen who dropped out of the program during the intervening summer of 1971. Reasons for dropping out ranged from dissatisfaction with the program (some expressed that the program did not meet their expectations), personal problems, to self acknowledgment that teaching was not "their bag." Eleven out of the 16 corpsmembers who had high GREs and high GPAs (meeting graduate school entrance requirements) dropped out of the program. All of these corpsmembers were Anglo.

Thirteen (85%) out of the 15 Mexican American corpsmen completed the program. Five (69%) of the 7 Black corpsmen completed the program. Thus, 18 (81%) of the 22 minority corpsmembers all of whom did not meet the standard graduate admissions criteria successfully completed the program.

There were 10 (48%) out of 23 Anglos who did not complete the program. All of the Anglos that dropped out had been admitted to graduate school at the outset of the program on the basis of meeting the minimum graduate school admissions criteria.

Thus, it was evident in the 5th Cycle experience that:

a) a significantly high number of Black and Mexican American corpsmembers fared satisfactorily in both their academic university work and school-community practicum undertakings in spite of not meeting the traditional GRE and GPA requirements for admissions to graduate school.

b) a screening process that focused on specific abilities and potential skills showed promising indications of effectively identifying capable graduate school candidates.

Seventh Cycle. The recruitment and selection process for 7th Cycle was a refinement of that utilized in 5th Cycle. This selection process was essentially the same as the one proposed for 9th Cycle.

There were 42 corpsmen recruited at the outset of the 7th Cycle program: 36 interns and 6 team leaders. The sex composition of the total program was 23 males and 19 females. The corpsmember ethnic composition was 25 Mexican Americans, 9 Blacks and 8 Anglos. Three corpsmen withdrew from the program. All three were self-deselections. One corpsman who was considered a poor marginal candidate for graduation was able to receive a teaching credential at the termination of the program. Thirty-eight corpsmen were able to successfully complete the program. Two corpsmen received a Master of Arts degree, while the rest received a Master of Education degree.

Total corpsmen composite GRE scores ranged from 470 to 1170. Out of the 9 corpsmen who scored the minimum 1000 or higher on the GRE there were 4 Anglos, 4 Mexican Americans and 1 Black. However, not all possessed a 3.0 or better GPA. Four (1 Black and 3 Mexican Americans) were deficient in their undergraduate grade-point averages. GRE scores for the majority of the Mexican American students were well distributed within the 500 and 900 range; 13 scored between 700 and 1000. Four Mexican Americans scored the minimum 1000 or higher. (See Table 5.)

Thus by the end of 7th Cycle:

a) thirty-eight corpsmen successfully completed the program.

b) thirty-one of these corpsmen were minority students (23 Mexican American and 8 Black), with only one meeting the normal graduate admissions criteria (1000 GRE and 3.0 GPA).

Summary of 5th and 7th Cycle. By May of 1974, The University of Texas at Austin through Teacher Corps project:

a) recruited and admitted 56 minority students into the Graduate School of Education in the Department of Curriculum and Instruction.

b) recruited and admitted 55 minority students who did not meet the standard graduate admissions criteria.

c) graduated 49 (89.3%) of the total 56 graduate students.

d) graduated 48 (85.7%) of the total 55 graduate students who did not meet the standard graduate admissions criteria.

e) recruited and admitted 40 Mexican Americans into the graduate school. Thirty-nine of the 40 did not meet the

standard graduate school admissions criteria.

f) graduated 36 of the total 40 Mexican American students.

g) graduated 35 of the 39 Mexican Americans who did not meet the standard graduate school admissions criteria.

h) recruited and admitted 16 Blacks into the graduate school. None of the 16 Blacks met the standard graduate school admissions criteria.

i) graduated 13 of the 16 Blacks.

Concluding Statement

It is difficult to trace the influence of the two Teacher Corps experiences upon the current University admissions policy. The corps-member admissions situation during the 5th Cycle was not clearly defined until the program was well into the sixth month of operation at which time all the interns who did not meet the formal admissions criteria were finally admitted. Informal interviews with the officials involved at the time the negotiations took place (Teacher Corps and Graduate School administrative staff) revealed that the Teacher Corps dilemma stimulated much in-house (Graduate School) discussion and certainly was influential in the establishment of the Special Admissions Program which is now fully operationalized within the system. Through this process a high degree of autonomy has been given to departmental graduate admissions within the School of Education allowing for an admissions process where desired candidate characteristics can be looked at more closely, thus enhancing a better match between student characteristics and the goals and objectives of the respective program.

The ninth Cycle program (in progress) admissions process was essentially the same utilized during seventh Cycle. There were forty-eight Teacher Corps participants admitted to the Graduate School via the Teacher Corps program's criteria and selection process. Thirty-four of these participants are minority students.

TABLE 1

Cycle V Corpsmember GPA, GRE, and Program Completion Data

Corpsmember Code	GRE	GPA	Completed Program
1	1130	3.64	X
2	1120	2.666	X
3	1130	3.48	
4	1250	3.48	X
5	1100	3.38	
6	1140	3.06	X
7	1240	3.5	
8	1380	4.0	
9	1140	2.833	
10	1200	3.18	X
11	1340	3.5	
12	1100	2.81	
13	1020	2.77	
14	1190	2.84	X
15	1250	2.71	
16	1140	2.92	X
17	950	3.27	X
18	1090	3.28	X
19	1000	2.11	X
20	900	3.3	X
21	790	2.78	X
22	720	2.69	X
23	760	2.3	X
24	630	2.95	X
25	1210	2.19	X
26	1200	2.14	
27	840	2.73	X
28	640	1.64	X
29	860	3.15	X
30	640	2.64	X
31	870	2.92	X
32	870	3.35	X
33	620	2.52	X
34	550	2.62	X
35	870	2.29	
36	740	2.8	X
37	480	2.61	
38	870	2.18	X
39	800	2.23	
40	430	2.81	
41	970	3.18	X
42	1070	2.87	X
43	920	2.79	X
44	530	2.62	X
45	790	2.97	X

TABLE 2

Cycle V
Mexican American Corpsmen Data

Corpsmember Code	GRE	GPA	Completed Program
19	1000	2.11	X
21	790	2.78	X
22	720	2.69	X
23	760	2.3	X
24	630	2.95	X
25	1210	2.19	X
27	840	2.73	X
28	640	1.64	X
29	860	3.15	X
32	870	3.35	X
38	870	2.18	X
39	800	2.23	
40	430	2.81	
44	530	2.62	X
45	790	2.97	X

TABLE 3

Cycle V
Black Corpsmen Data

Corpsmember Code	GRE	GPA	Completed Program
17	950	3.27	X
30	640	2.64	X
33	620	2.52	X
34	550	2.62	X
35	870	2.29	
36	740	2.8	X
37	480	2.61	

TABLE 4

Cycle VII Corpsmember GPA, GRE, and Program Completion Data

Corpsmember Code	GRE	GPA	Withdrew from Program
1	1170	3.7	
2	950	2.15	
3	830	2.16	
4	810	2.33	X
5	800	2.31	
6	520	3.00	
7	560	2.66	
8	1040	3.01	
9	750	2.46	
10	510	2.14	
11	740	3.00	
12	570	1.93	
13	1010	2.71	
14	830	2.58	
15	510	2.00	X
16	1100	3.07	
17	670	2.41	
18	860	2.36	
19	800	2.27	
20	1060	2.07	
21	620	2.14	
22	830	3.29	
23	630	3.07	
24	1000	2.57	
25	510	2.47	
26	850	3.06	
27	1090	3.08	
28	1040	2.51	
29	940	2.84	
30	760	3.72	
31	1130	3.54	
32	960	2.27	
33	520	2.50	
34	610	2.64	
35	620	2.93	
36	930	3.40	
37	540	2.52	
38	790	2.20	
39	770	2.05	
40	750	2.72	
41	470	2.26	
42	890	2.85	

TABLE 5

Cycle VII
Mexican American Corpsmen Data

Corpsmember Code	GRE	GPA	Withdrew from Program
5	800	2.31	
6	520	3.00	
9	750	2.46	
13	1010	2.71	
14	830	2.58	
15	510	2.00	X
17	670	2.41	
18	870	2.36	
19	800	2.27	
21	620	2.14	
22	830	3.29	
23	630	3.07	
24	1000	2.57	
26	850	3.06	
28	1040	2.51	
12	570	1.93	
29	940	2.84	
30	760	3.72	
31	1130	3.54	
32	960	2.27	
34	610	2.64	
35	620	2.93	
38	790	2.20	
39	770	2.05	
40	750	2.72	

TABLE 6

Cycle VII
Black Corpsmen Data

Corpsmember Code	GRE	GPA	Withdrew from Program
3	830	2.16	
7	560	2.66	
10	510	2.14	
20	1060	2.07	
25	510	2.47	
33	520	2.50	
37	540	2.52	
41	470	2.26	
42	890	2.85	

ROLE DESCRIPTIONS OF TEACHER CORPS PERSONNEL

Sumpter L. Brooks

Overview

> *The Federal Government is committed to the proposition that if we want to bring about change in the direction in which our schools and colleges are moving, we first have to bring about change in the kinds and quality of the people who staff our schools and colleges. The Teacher Corps is a manifestation of this commitment.* (Allen, 1969)

Teacher Corps personnel are generally considered to be the "change agents" with the commitment and willingness to bring about desirable changes in our educational system. These persons are usually unwilling to see our educational system settle into an anachronous relic. They want it to respond to the needs of our society by becoming sensitive to the problems of "difficult classrooms," which societal neglect has created. At the same time they want it to serve as a vehicle for a new life style, for them as well as the pupils from low-income families who man those "difficult classrooms." Teacher Corps is a means by which this unique cadre of educators can keep alive young people's belief that education provides a key to change and reform. Therefore, educators which comprise Teacher Corps are committed to explore the unknown, and experiment with the untried, in their efforts to expand to change the unaltered.

Further, this rare breed of educators recognizes the benefits of cultural confluence and is willing to acquire the skills, understandings, and attitudes which are essential to work effectively within a pluralistic society. In this regard, they are willing to supplement cognitive curricula with more humanistic and affective designs that promote the dignity and worth of all learners.

Teacher Corps Staff and Project Administration

Qualifications

It is recommended that each project will have one full-time person serving as director or associate director or university coordinator at either the university or the school. Because he or she is usually critical to the success of a project, a director should make a commitment to serve for the duration of a project.

The administrative and instructional staff of a Teacher Corps project should reflect a multicultural (multiethnic) composition and

some of the staff should have had direct personal involvement with the communities served. In considering candidates for any positions on a Teacher Corps project staff, care should be exercised that those chosen relate well with the communities to be served. When projects are designed to meet the educational needs of any minority group, at least one-half of the administrative and instructional staff should be from that ethnic group.

An important qualification for a Teacher Corps staff member is that he or she is committed to the changes sought by the school district and the university, as described in the proposal. The person designated as Teacher Corps Director should have voting faculty status at the university and should fit the specifications of the job as defined by the project. In projects where the director is employed by the school district, the university coordinator should have voting status. Projects which have an emphasis in an academic discipline should consider appointing as the project director or deputy a faculty member of the college of arts and sciences with expertise in the subject matter field.

The role groups of Teacher Corps staff and administration are: (1) Director, (2) Associate Director, (3) Program Development Specialist, (4) Team Leaders, (5) Community Coordinator, (6) Interns, (7) Community Volunteers, (8) Supervisory Teachers, (9) Principals, (10) LEA-Coordinator, (11) Superintendents, and (12) IHE Faculty Members. The section which follows describes the major roles and characteristics of each of the Teacher Corps personnel.

Director

The project director takes primary responsibility for developing and administering the programs of teacher education. He or she insures that the project has the support of the deans of the colleges of education and arts and sciences. Before a project begins, he or she secures agreement by department heads and faculty committees for the adoption of the features of the project which prove successful. He or she plans with the school district for the teacher education component of the project. He or she helps organize selection panels, prepares invitation kits, meets regularly with intern and community groups. He or she must have demonstrated leadership abilities with young people. The project director (or program development specialist) is responsible for a continuous process evaluation of the university program, with input from university and school personnel, the community and from Corps-members, to determine whether the project is fulfilling the spirit and intent of the proposal, whether it is meeting the needs of the school district and university, whether the proposal itself is in keeping with those needs, and if not, for developing amendments to the project agreement to modify and restructure it accordingly.

In an Urban Teacher Corps project, where the project director is employed by the school district, he or she should assume the duties of the school district coordinator and the overall responsibilities for the direction of the project, including the development of the university subcontract. An Urban Teacher Corps director or his or her associate should serve full-time during preservice and inservice.

More specifically the role of the Project Director includes the following:

1. Coordinating and implementing Teacher Corps National Guidelines as reflected by the approved proposal with addendums.
2. Maintaining a comfortable working balance between the components of the project—community, university, and public schools—through a parity relationship.
3. Arranging and coordinating the activities of all administrative and instructional personnel for the university phase of the project to insure that educational needs and project requirements are satisfied.
4. Preparing and managing all fiscal affairs for the operation of the total project.
5. Maintaining lines of communication among the major components of the project and between the National Office in Washington and the local project.
6. Insuring availability of necessary resources—human and material—for effective implementation of the project.
7. Serving as an instructor and/or consultant to Team Leaders, assisting them in implementing their roles.
8. Establishing and/or executing guidelines or procedures for periodic project evaluation and reporting.
9. Maintaining an awareness of the total project by scheduling regular meetings with staff, interns, and cooperating persons from the three major components—university, community, and public schools.
10. Coordinating job placement for interns working cooperatively with LEA Coordinator to be sure that school and individual needs and interests are effectively matched.
11. Performing other duties as deemed necessary by the Management Team for the continuous on-going success of the project.

Associate or Assistant Project Director

The Associate or Assistant Director reports to the Teacher Corps Director and through him or her is accountable to the management body. He or she shares the task for smooth administration, open communication between office personnel and instructional staff, and for all activities related to corpsmembers support, school-community affairs, and staff development.

Specifically, the role of the Associate/Assistant Director includes the following:

1. Coordinating procedures—working cooperatively with the Project Development Specialist—for all seminars and instructional activities.
2. Coordinating procedures—working cooperatively with LEA Coordinator—for all university related evaluation sessions.
3. Insuring that the Project Director is apprised of all developments affecting the continuous on-going operation of the project.
4. Coordinating intern committees and meeting regularly with all university staff, interns, team leaders, parents, and LEA Coordinator to insure open communication and effective program operation.
5. Providing technical assistance and support service—working cooperatively with community coordinator—to parents and community volunteers on matters related to the school and community.
6. Effecting clear and constant communication with the Project Director in order to execute project policies and conduct administrative affairs during the director's absence.
7. Performing other duties relative to the on-going operation of the project, as deemed necessary by the Project Director.

Program Development Specialist

The Program Development Specialist should be knowledgeable about competency-based education development, systematic management, and formative and summative evaluation techniques. He or she should be competent in the development of instructional systems, the development and revision of systematic management plans, the on-going development of competency-based curricula, and the continuing dissemination of successful Teacher Corps elements to the total college program.

Specifically the role of the Program Development Specialist includes the following:

1. Providing instruction for Corpsmembers in the area of curriculum development.
2. Assisting faculty members in the College/School of Education in transforming method courses to competency-based courses so that the instructors will be able to define performance objectives prior to the beginning of the course, evaluate those objectives, and apply them in assessing the achievement of students.
3. Assisting the Director and/or Associate Director in assessing the instructional program and in making changes in the program based on the needs as reflected by assessments.
4. Coordinating consulting services in matters related to curriculum and serving as consultant in areas of personal expertise: i.e., behavior modification, social studies, concept learning, rule learning, problem solving and curriculum design.
5. Assisting coordinators of other aspects of the program in providing experiences for interns which narrow the competency gaps treated in other formal course work.
6. Working with Texas Education Agency Teacher Corps liaison on problems related to certification requirements.
7. Working with deans or coordinators of graduate and/or undergraduate studies on problems related to admission and degree requirements.
8. Performing other duties related to the on-going improvement of the instructional program as deemed necessary by the Teacher Corps Director.

Team Leaders

The role of team leaders is one of great importance to the overall operation of the Teacher Corps Project at the local level and to the professional growth and development of the interns and others involved in the total project. Team leaders are expected to be able to lead and assume a role of self direction and responsibility.

Further, the team leaders' change agent role focuses upon processes. This is considered a new area of curriculum (Jung, 1971) and calls for competencies dealing with intrapersonal and interpersonal relationships, group organizational processes, planning and implementing

improvement effects, kinds of decision making, negotiating, and self evaluation as an on-going process.

The team leaders' role is to intervene in terms of relating task, human interaction, and inquiry and to assist himself and primarily the interns to relate cognitive with affective, process with content (Mallan, 1971).

Specifically, the role of team leaders includes the following:

1. Explaining the rationale, objectives and plans of the Teacher Corps Projects to interns, supervisory teacher, community persons and others as deemed necessary by the Project Directors.
2. Assisting personnel in the project to implement the project objectives of the university, school and community.
3. Guiding interns in techniques of developing instructional modules.
4. Counseling interns in regard to personal problems, interests, and concerns.
5. Guiding and assisting interns in their field work as they attempt to carry out their learning experiences in classrooms and in the community.
6. Making arrangements with supervisory teachers for interns and teachers to plan, team teach, and interact with one another.
7. Reviewing with interns, degree plans and maintaining a progress report of the interns' course work.
8. Making provisions for the inclusion of supervisory teachers in Teacher Corps on-going project operations by involving them in evaluation, planning, and curriculum development sessions with interns.
9. Assisting supervisory teachers in defining their role in the total Teacher Corps Project.
10. Serving as liaison between public school, community and university.
11. Certifying to proper authorities that interns have demonstrated mastery of specified competencies.
12. Performing other duties as deemed necessary by the building principal and/or Teacher Corps Project Director.

Community Coordinators

The community coordinator is a key figure in the overall design of the Teacher Corps Project. He or she is responsible for coordinating, with the Teacher Corps Staff, all activities and projects of the community served by Teacher Corps.

Specifically, the role of the community coordinators includes the following:

1. Developing and implementing all community-based, volunteer-assisted educational activities and projects.
2. Assisting interns in descerning ways to learn and plan cooperatively with community persons.
3. Initiating creative ways for involving parents and school personnel in the development of community projects.
4. Serving as a liaison between the community, school, and university.
5. Obtaining and relating information of community concern to the Teacher Corps Staff.
6. Assisting interns in designing, implementing, and assessing community-based programs.
7. Implementing the objectives of Teacher Corps in relation to community-based education.
8. Working with team leaders in evaluating the community-based experiences of interns.
9. Designing and implementing programs for training and involving community persons for active participation in Teacher Corps activities.
10. Performing other duties relative to community-based education as deemed necessary by the Teacher Corps Project Director.

Interns

Of course, the central figure of any Teacher Corps Project is the intern. All activities of Teacher Corps revolve around the professional development of interns who are seeking a career in the education of low-income children.

Some of the qualities important for Teacher Corps interns to have are stability and maturity. Empathy with children and adults who have different backgrounds, points of view, and life-styles is imperative.

Specifically, the role of interns includes the following:

1. Demonstrating a sense of commitment to the development

and improvement of education opportunities for children from low-income families.

2. Serving as a catalyst in the union of school, community and university in developing and improving the educational opportunity of children from low-income families.
3. Developing and applying skills in classroom management which will provide more relevant education for pupils.
4. Expanding his or her knowledge of children from poverty stricken areas and understanding the background and the problems which these children encounter daily.
5. Motivating, assisting and guiding the pupils with whom he or she works in receiving the best possible education.
6. Keeping abreast with current research, innovations, and alternate teaching strategies which are available to them in education.
7. Completing degree requirements as specified by the approved Teacher Corps Proposal.
8. Developing all competencies necessary for Teacher Certification as specified in the approved proposal.
9. Performing other duties relative to the school, community, and university as deemed necessary by the Teacher Corps Project Director.

Community Volunteers

The major role of community volunteers is to serve in whatever capacity necessary to extend the influence and impact of Teacher Corps into the community at large. Community volunteers report directly to the community coordinator and assist him or her in planning and implementing school and community programs which are assessed as needs and concerns of the community.

The role of community volunteers includes the following:

1. Assisting community coordinators and corpsmembers in grouping parents and community leaders for involvement in school and community activities.
2. Helping interns facilitate their community responsibility by acting as liaison between Teacher Corps personnel and community residents.
3. Assisting interns develop bilingual skills, if necessary, while working with community residents.

4. Assisting interns in becoming familiar with the values and life styles of the target community, which may be different from their own.

5. Familiarizing residents of the community with the purposes of Teacher Corps.

6. Explaining to parents school decisions which affect their children.

7. Interacting with supervisory teachers and interns in classroom sessions in ways which will facilitate the achievement of pupils.

8. Performing other duties relative to community based education as deemed necessary by the community coordinator and approved by the Teacher Corps Project Director.

Cooperating Teachers

Cooperating teachers play an essential role in the professional development of interns. It is through them that interns develop most of their practical classroom experiences: i.e., team planning, team teaching, implementing teaching strategies, and reporting pupil progress, to name a few.

Cooperating teachers should be carefully selected to be assured that interns are exposed to the highest possible level of professional experiences. Further, they should be flexible, interpersonal, willing to explore new innovations, and process orientated.

The specific role of cooperating teachers include the following:

1. Assisting the team leader and principal with intern placement.

2. Planning the instructional program with which the intern is involved cooperatively with the intern and the team leader.

3. Providing formative and summative data for the interns' evaluation through conferences with the team leader and university professor.

4. Making objective classroom observation of the intern in actual teacher-learning situations, and providing objective feedback to interns based on the interns' observed performance.

5. Providing interns with alternative methods, strategies, materials and teaching behaviors to meet the needs of the children being served.

6. Providing time for individual conferences with interns and team leaders.

7. Working with team leaders in evaluating interns' work based upon observed performance and providing formative and summative data to document evaluation results.

8. Providing a creative learning environment which fosters initiative, exploration and self-assurance among interns.

9. Performing other duties relative to intern supervision as deemed necessary by team leaders and approved by the Teacher Corps Project Director.

Building Principals

The attitude and support of building principals are vital links to the success of Teacher Corps Projects. Without the sanction and absolute support of building principals toward the approved Teacher Corps model, the project cannot hope to be successful in achieving its stated objectives. Building principals are the energizing forces which are essential in fostering unquestionable success or failure in Teacher Corps activities in the school and community.

The specific role of building principals include the following:

1. Supervising the activities of building personnel in ways which will foster the achievement of Teacher Corps objectives as reflected in the approved proposal.

2. Collaborating with team leaders in ways which provide ongoing direction, supervision, and evaluation of project activities in the school building.

3. Maintaining open communication between all segments of the Teacher Corps Project within the school building.

4. Recognizing and recommending needed changes in the operations of the Teacher Corps Project to the Project Director.

5. Assisting interns and community persons in establishing appropriate community-based educational projects.

6. Identifying, reporting and/or recommending solutions to problems encountered in the operation of the project.

7. Performing other duties relative to the smooth operation of Teacher Corps as recommended by the LEA-Coordinator and approved by the Teacher Corps Project Director.

LEA Coordinators

The LEA-Coordinator makes the major operational decisions with regard to the impact of the Teacher Corps Project on the school district. His role is to coordinate, with the staff from Teacher Corps, the university, and the community, the project activities of the school district.

Specifically, the LEA-Coordinator's role includes the following:

1. Providing orientation and/or instruction relative to the district's policies to interns, and community persons.
2. Holding periodic meetings with interns, parents, coordinators, team leaders, and university personnel on matters which affect them with regard to district policies.
3. Serving as a consultant for interns and community personnel, whenever necessary.
4. Serving as a source of information to district personnel regarding university-school programs which are available to them.
5. Preparing and coordinating the fiscal matters of the district which are connected with Teacher Corps operations.
6. Conducting school related staff development activities which foster the achievement of Teacher Corps objectives as reflected by the approved proposal.
7. Making classroom observation of interns in actual teacher-learning situations and providing feedback to interns based on those observations.
8. Assisting and/or making recommendations on the assignment of interns to schools and/or supervisory teachers relative to internship during the two year project cycle.
9. Assisting and/or making recommendations on the placement of interns relative to employment at the termination of the project.
10. Performing other duties relative to district policies as deemed necessary by the district superintendent and approved by Teacher Corps Project Director.

School Superintendent

The superintendent is a vital link between the university and the school district. The success of the program also depends on his or her cooperation and approval.

The specific role of the district superintendent includes the following:

1. Assisting the Teacher Corps Project Director in identifying target schools and competent personnel from the district who are to assume positions in the overall program.
2. Providing the necessary support services for the successful operation of the Teacher Corps Project.
3. Facilitating the placement of interns within the district once they have successfully completed the Teacher Corps Project.

IHE Faculty Members

The Institute of Higher Education faculty members represent a very important component of Teacher Corps. They provide interns with the instructional knowledge and performance skills which are necessary for successful internship experience in the public schools. The role and responsibility of IHE faculty members follows:

1. Developing instructional modules, based on their area of expertise, to be field-tested and revised for interns and students in the regular teacher training program at the university.
2. Preparing modular materials which might be used for intern training in subsequent preservice activities.
3. Providing instruction for interns during the regular session using modular materials.
4. Developing improved competencies through the utilization of instructional modules in seminars for teachers in the regular teacher training program at the university.
5. Teaching on demonstration teams whenever possible with interns and supervisory teachers.
6. Evaluating intern progress with reference to formal class work taken under their supervision.
7. Performing other duties relative to university instruction of Teacher Corps personnel as deemed necessary by the Teacher Corps Project Director.

References

Allen, J. E. "Teacher Corps–A Catalyst for Change," *Provoking Change in Education*, A report on the 1967 Teacher Corps National Conference (Washington, D.C.: 1969), p. 3.

Jung, C. C. "Competencies for Team Leaders in Facilitating Change," *Perspectives on the Role of Teacher Corps Team Leaders.* (Toledo, Ohio: University of Toledo, 1971). Published for Teacher Corps Educational Personnel Development Branch, U.S. Office of Education, p. 35.

Mallan, J. *Curriculum Guide: Team Leaders as Change Agents.* (Washington, D.C.: Department of HEW, Office of EPDA, 1971), p. 4.

Note to Reader:

The writer of this chapter wishes to inform the reader that the role descriptions for each of the groups which are presented in this chapter are not intended to be all inclusive. By its very design, each Teacher Corps Project is unique, and therefore, has specific needs which influence the role description of its personnel. The role descriptions presented in this chapter are those which the writer feels are generic to all Teacher Corps Projects regardless to their scope and focus.

Sumpter Brooks

MANAGING TEACHER CORPS PROJECTS

Dell Felder

The school is unique among formal institutions in our society. What it seeks to produce, and the processes it uses to that end, are both basically human. For this reason, effective education management requires abilities related to the practice of both an art and a science. To assume that an educational enterprise can be managed in a responsive and responsible manner merely by the exercise of technical, mechanistic administrative procedures is to deny nature of the human condition.

Teacher Corps managers may find it necessary to rely on the art of administration to a great extent, for Teacher Corps projects present unique and unusual management problems. Essentially projects are created as *sub-systems* derived from two or more participating institutions which exert both the guiding and constraining forces of *supra-systems.* The sub-system, or project must function in harmony with the institutional philosophies and operating policies of the supra-systems, the LEA and IHE. The project is subject to two or more masters, therefore, and Teacher Corps managers must be consciously aware that it is possible for project goals to be suffocated through the competing and sometimes unconscious behavior of parent institutions. The project is free to pursue its mission only to the extent that the philosophies and policies of the LEA and IHE are compatible with it or can be compatibly alligned through negotiation.

A Teacher Corps project is also significantly influenced by Teacher Corps Washington which functions as another master. All projects are expected to meet certain conditions and Teacher Corps Washington holds projects accountable for complying with their established guidelines. For example, Washington expects projects to deliver competency-based teacher education programs, to conduct significant portions of their training activities in school sites, and to involve community residents in program governance and operations. In part, Washington's purpose is to effect institutional change in the LEA and IHE. But Teacher Corps managers can find themselves "caught in the middle." The project's accountability to Washington must be addressed, but managers must meet this responsibility in ways which do not seriously violate the institutional constraints imposed by the LEA and IHE.

The personnel participating in the project are the most important, and sometimes the most difficult, force with which Teacher Corps managers must deal. Interns, community residents, team leaders, cooperating teachers, University faculty, and LEA administrators converge into the project from diverse backgrounds and with different expectations. These differences generate both positive and negative forces in

program operations. Managers must be capable of dealing with both the opportunities and problems which result.

From the outset, Teacher Corps managers should expect to deal with complex circumstances. They must balance the competing desires of parent institutions while more often than not, forgoing into reality an instructional program which has not existed before. They will find, however, that they are only the architects of this new program. They alone cannot make it happen. They must depend upon those who participate in the project to make the program's dreams a reality. University faculty, LEA personnel, community residents, and interns must all be given opportunity for responsible participation in program development.

It is essential to recognize that a Teacher Corps management system has a *dependent* and supportive relationship to the instructional program. It is equally important to understand that this dependent relationship does not imply that the management system can or should be passive in nature. It cannot wait for express directives from the instructional program before taking action. Rather, the system must be capable of aggressively generating information and taking action necessary to provide leadership in organizing and deploying the human and material resources to meet program objectives. The primary aim of project managers should be to create a management system which can responsively and responsibly serve the instructional program and project personnel.

Collaborative Decision Making

A Teacher Corps project will require support functions similar to those found in most instructional programs. Personnel must be recruited, selected, and trained. Instructional materials must be developed and procedures for facilitating the instructional process must be defined. Arrangements must be made to secure the necessary instructional materials, equipment, and facilities. Procedures must be established to evaluate program effectiveness and to assure that program adaptations are made in response to systematic appraisal. Management information must be continuously generated to provide the data necessary for on-going program decisions.

The decisioning process in a Teacher Corps project is somewhat different from those found in most instructional programs, however. Because Teacher Corps programs are the joint responsibility of several institutions, collaboration is necessary to effect most management decisions. The project staff must assure that this collaboration is facilitated both formally and informally through the management system.

Projects will find it helpful to define explicity decision-making processes. It is essential that these processes be both effective and efficient. If the goals of the program are to be realized, decision-making cannot remain in the hands of a few individuals. To assure *effective* decisions, personnel from all levels in the project should be involved. Widespread involvement in decisioning, however, can become very costly in terms of a project's human resources. To assure *efficiency*, therefore, care should be exercised to assure appropriate involvement. Generally, personnel who will be directly influenced by any given opportunity to participate. The management staff should be ever conscious of the demands placed on the time of personnel, however, and should strive to conserve this valuable resource as much as possible.

At least three broad types of decisions are necessary for operation of the program. These can be described as policy decisions, operational decisions, and technical or implementation decision. Most Teacher Corps projects are organized in a similar manner and all organizational patterns reflect a management structure which can accommodate the three types of decisions. Since the author has direct experience with the University of Houston/Houston Independent School District (UH/HISD) project, this program will be used to illustrate how collaborative decisioning is facilitated through a Teacher Corps management system.

Since policy level decisions directly influence all program operations, projects generally include representatives of all personnel in this management group. In most projects, this group is called the Steering Committee. In the UH/HISD project, this group is called the Advisory Board and is composed of the Teacher Corps Director, a site school building principal, a team leader, an intern, a community coordinator, two parents of children served by the program, two sixth grade students, a representative of the Houston Teachers Association, a representative of the Houston Principal's Association, two site school cooperating teachers, two University faculty members, two LEA Area Superintendents, and the Model Cities Neighborhood Commissioner. The Advisory Board meets regularly and is assigned responsibility for establishing policy for direction of Teacher Corps program operations.

The UH/HISD Teacher Corps Advisory Board is not empowered to modify the existing policies of the school district, the University, or the Texas Education Agency. For this reason, another formal group, the Policy Board, is designated in the UH/HISD management system to resolve policy conflicts should they arise. The Policy Board is chaired by the General Superintendent of HISD and is convened only as need arises. Members of the Board are officials from participating institutions who have authority to negotiate the policies of their respective institutions.

General operational decisions in the UH/HISD project are made by a management group called the Task Team. Task Team members are the Teacher Corps Director, the Associate Directors for the University, LEA, and Community, the Staff Development Specialist, and an Area Assistant Superintendent of HISD. This management group meets biweekly to review program operations and to assess the degree to which project objectives are being met. Each member of the Task Team places items on the agenda and all major operational decisions are made by this group. The Task Team is further responsible for delineating staff and instructional assignments and for establishing schedules for initation and completion of tasks.

The Task Team does not have authority to make decisions which influence either LEA or University operations outside the Teacher Corps project. Another group, the Management Team, is formally assigned responsibility for making decisions which cannot be handled at the Task Team level. The Management Team is convened as the need arises and is composed of the Dean and Associate Dean of the College of Education, and the Chief Instructional Officer and participating Area Superintendents of HISD. An example of decisions which the Management Team might address would be the relocation of a corpsmember team to another building within the school district or the extension of field-based inservice instruction provided through Teacher Corps.

Policy decisions should clearly express the ground rules which will govern a Teacher Corps project's operations and should provide the general focus for the program. Most major policy decisions should be negotiated between participating institutions **before** the project is initiated and should be reflected in the proposal submitted for funding. Much confusion can be avoided if the major policies for operation of the program are established in advance through agreement of participating institutions.

Operational decisions, on the other hand, must be made continuously. Insofar as possible, these decisions should focus on defining the general procedures for resolving a problem rather than determining in detail the specific actions that will be necessary to implement the decision. This allows those who are assigned responsibility for implementing operational decisions some opportunity to exercise their professional judgement and discretion in relation to the actions they take. A description of the process followed in the UH/HISD project for making technical or implementation decisions will be discussed in a later section.

Teacher Corps projects must also provide opportunity for interns and community representatives to participate in the decisioning process. Most projects have formal Intern Councils which are responsible for dealing with the problems and concerns of interns. The Intern Council

in the UH/HISD project meets each month with the Task Team to submit suggestions and recommendations to project managers and to share through discussion perceptions of program operations. Some projects have established several formal groups to deal with the problems and concerns of interns. For example, the University of Texas project has a Corpsmember Curriculum Committee, a Corpsmember Publicity Committee, and a Corpsmember Grievance Committee. In all projects, interns have a representative voice on the Steering Committee or Advisory Board.

Most projects also provide some formal means by which community input can be utilized in the decisioning process. In some projects, Community Councils are established for each participating Teacher Corps site school. In the UH/HISD project, School-Community Advisory Councils which include community representatives, building faculty and administrators, and Teacher Corps staff members provide opportunity for community residents to participate in decisions related to program operations. In addition, community residents are represented on Steering Committees in all projects and through the project's community coordinator on most major management groups.

Collaborative decision-making is essential to the operation of a Teacher Corps project. Projects will find that this can be best facilitated by formalizing management groups which include representation from the LEA, IHE, and the project and by clearly delineating the decisioning responsibilities of each. All management groups must recognize and be sensitive to the exclusive decisioning responsibilities of the LEA, the IHE, and the Texas Education Agency. A project management group cannot, as a general rule, supersede the authorities of these institutions. For example, while the LEA should have significant input into decisions regarding the academic training of interns, the ultimate responsibility for this component of the program is vested with the IHE. Furthermore, neither the IHE nor the LEA is free to modify arbitrarily the certification requirements established by the Texas Education Agency. Also the IHE and the project must comply with the administrative and board policies of the LEA.

Project Organization and Management Roles

The organizational patterns of most Teacher Corps projects are quite similar. Generally, a project director is assigned overall executive responsibility for the program. He is usually assisted by one or more assistant directors, a program development specialist, a LEA coordinator, and a community coordinator. Interns assigned to each building site are supervised by one or more team leaders.

In the UH/HISD project, three associate directors assist in program operations. The Associate Director for the LEA is responsible

for all activities which directly involve the school district and serves as the chief liaison between the HISD and the University. He is assigned all LEA administrative responsibilities related to operation of the program; i.e., LEA budget matters, personnel services, compliance with Teacher Corps Washington guidelines and district policy. The Associate Director for the University is responsible for development and supervision of the interns' teacher education program. He directs and supervises the program development and instructional activities of Teacher Corps faculty and serves as academic advisor to all interns. In addition, he has responsibility for the inservice component of the program and for the training of team leaders. The Associate Director for the Community is responsible for coordinating and facilitating the activities of corpsmember teams and site school community coordinators in four major community projects. These include a recreational program, a tutorial program, a bilingual instructional support program, and an adult ESL and basic literacy program.

The UH/HISD project also employs a Staff Development Specialist (SDS) who serves as an on-site operations manager. The SDS supervises team leaders, coordinates and schedules the on-site training activities of University faculty, directs the operation of the field-based Learning Resource Center, works directly with principals for administration of program activities at the building level, and serves as general manager for the inservice program and community component.

Three team leaders are assigned to each Teacher Corps site school. They work under the general supervision of the SDS but are directly responsible to building principals for program operations. They supervise approximately 15 interns in each building.

Team Leaders play a significant management role in the UH/HISD project. A major premise of this management system is that decisions should be made at the lowest level possible. Every effort is made to define only the general procedures for resolving management problems at the Director and Associate Director levels. Team Leaders are thereby assigned major management responsibilities in terms of implementation decisions. This has proven beneficial in two ways. First, one purpose of the program is to train Team Leaders to assume management roles. Opportunity to gain wide experience dealing with management problems contributes significantly to this training. Second, most implementation decisions must take into account situational contexts and variables. Team Leaders function at the closest operations level. As a general rule, therefore, they are in a much better position to define the specific actions needed to resolve any particular problem.

Team Leaders also are given extensive instructional responsibilities. Under the supervision of the Associate Director for the University and faculty members, they facilitate the interns' learning experiences

and often assess the degree to which interns' demonstrate the competencies specified. In some cases, they are also responsible for negotiating with interns the criterion levels and assessment procedures which will be employed.

Team leaders have found that they cannot act independently of one another in management and instructional roles. Decisions made in response to specific problems tend to establish precedents for future program operations. For this reason, it is essential that each Team Leader communicate with and involve the other Team Leaders and the Staff Development Specialist in management decisions. UH/HISD Teacher Corps site schools are closely located and this makes it possible for Team Leaders to meet frequently for management purposes. The SDS has primary responsibility for maintaining communications with all other project personnel and plays a significant role in identifying situations and problems which should be dealt with be various management groups.

Management Information Systems

Projects will find that information will be continuously needed to assess the extent to which program objectives are being met and to identify problems in program operations. This calls for some system for generating and disseminating information which insures that all management components are appropriately informed of events, conditions, and decisions influencing their operations. Such data are also essential for formal reporting purposes. Teacher Corps Washington requires information concerning program operations on a regular basis. Generally, discrepancy evaluation reports which document the program's progress must be submitted at the conclusion of the preservice, first year inservice, intervening summer, and second year inservice periods.*

Projects have developed different ways for gathering and reporting management information. Some Directors request written reports monthly from key management personnel. All projects depend heavily on staff meetings for information reporting and sharing. Regardless of the system, used, the major purpose for generating such information should be to provide a data base for management decisions. Several key questions must be addressed in this process. What information is needed? For what purposes will it be used? To whom and how will it be communicated? What procedures will assure the most effective and efficient system for data collection and dissemination?

A description of the procedures used in the UH/HISD project will illustrate one system for generating and reporting management information. Shortly after the project was initiated, the management staff analyzed each of the objectives established for the program and

*Editors Note: Teacher Corps Washington is now requiring quarterly evaluation reports in a discrepancy evaluation format.

detailed the tasks which would be necessary to achieve these objectives. These tasks were then assigned to various members of the staff and dates for the initiation and completion of all proposed activities were established. This information was formalized into a document which serves as the basis for generating monthly reports regarding program operations.

At the end of each month, each staff member receives a form on which he reports activities in relation to his assigned responsibilities. These written reports are then compiled into a Monthly Progress Report by a graduate assistant. Interns also have input into this document through regular reports of the activities of the Intern Council.

The Monthly Progress Report is distributed to all members of the project staff, to officials in HISD and the University, to members of the Intern Council, and to building principals. The Task Team reviews this report each month and uses the information to assess overall program operations, to identify and/or anticipate problems, and to initiate corrective or adaptive action. The report also communicates essential information about program operations to a wide spectrum of project participants. The systematic reporting of information monthly also provides a substantial body of data which are useful in documenting the program's progress.

While the system described above assures that information will be reported and disseminated regularly, it does not provide program operations data on a *timely* basis. As long as activities are on schedule and proceeding as anticipated, few problems arise. But when unexpected situations or problems occur, it is often critical that data be immediately available to guide and support management decisions. For this reason, project managers need to maintain open communications at all times and each individual should clearly understand the areas of responsibility assigned to all members of the staff. This will facilitate the generation of information on call and will expedite dissemination of such information to those personnel who have greatest need for it in dealing with emergency situations.

Program Monitoring Systems

In all instructional programs, some system for monitoring the progress of trainees must be established. In a Teacher Corps project, this system must provide a variety of assessment forms because the training program is individualized, to some extent personalized, sometimes largely self-instructional in nature, and involves evaluation of an intern's performance in several different program components.

One essential characteristic of a competency-based instructional program is that the student is held accountable for demonstration of the prescribed competencies, not for the processes involved in develop-

ing those competencies. Objectives are explicitly defined, and assessment procedures and criterion levels are described and made public in advance. This permits the intern to monitor one aspect of his progress on a continuous basis. As University faculty and/or team leaders assess his performance in relation to any given objective or set of objectives, the intern is provided immediate feedback concerning his progress in the academic component of the program.

Most interns, however, need additional information regarding their progress. They want to know how they are doing in their community work and in their internship in the school. Most importantly, they want to know how they "stack up" generally in relation to the project's overall professional practices standards. And they need to know as soon as possible if they have deficiencies which should be corrected and what procedures they might follow to remediate these.

Most Teacher Corps projects have some formal, systematic means of communicating with interns regarding their progress. In the UH/HISD project, assessment conferences are held with interns every three months. These conferences are attended by the intern, the Project Director, the Associate Directors for the LEA, the University, and the Community, the Staff Development Specialist, and Team Leaders. Information useful to an overall assessment of the intern's work is collected prior to the conference from team leaders, University faculty, cooperating teachers, the building principal, community coordinators, and from the intern himself.

During the conference, staff members assess the intern's overall progress in the program to date and share with him their perceptions of his strengths and weaknesses. In the event that serious problems exist, the intern is given a detailed description of his deficiencies and specific suggestions regarding remediation procedures. Opportunity is also provided for the intern to discuss any problems he has encountered and seek assistance from the staff.

Team leaders, cooperating teachers, and University faculty can take advantage of many informal opportunities to share with interns information about their performance. Most interns want to know how they are doing and are not reluctant to seek the opinions of those with whom they work. Some of the anxieties interns may feel can often be reduced considerably if they have a clear understanding of what is expected of them. It is most helpful if all major program requirements are delineated in writing and shared with interns at an early stage in the program. If the rules of the game should change, and sometimes situations require this, such changes should be communicated clearly and promptly with appropriate accompanying explanations.

Teacher Corps projects generally use a clinical approach in the supervision of interns. Efforts are made to describe objectively, based

upon available data, exactly what the intern was doing as his performance was observed. Value judgments are avoided if at all possible and the intern is encouraged to assess his own performance in relation to previously established objectives. This procedure, if skillfully employed, usually results in a high trust relationship and positive rapport between the intern and those who evaluate him. He is thus able to assume increasing responsibility for assessment of his own behavior as a professional and to determine independently the improvements he wishes to make. In most projects, the ultimate goal is for the intern to develop and employ the skills necessary to define for himself the quality of his performance as a teacher.

Some Further Thoughts

All Teacher Corps programs will encounter problems. Many of these cannot be anticipated or avoided. Some, on the other hand, can be effectively handled through the application of a few simple management principles.

First, everyone participating in the project should clearly understand his role. This is not as easy as it may seem, for there are frequently no role modles for individuals or groups to follow. How do you describe the many roles a team leader may be called upon to play to someone who has no experiential referents for understanding these various and complex functions? How do you define and delineate the responsibilities of an Intern Council from those of project management in advance of situations which may require such clarification? How do you differentiate University faculty roles from those of cooperating teachers and team leaders prior to any opportunity to assess what various individuals can responsibly handle? Basically, you do the best you can and you continuously stress the evolutionary nature of the project. To pioneer requires a high tolerance for ambiguity and the ability to "roll with the punches." Those who work in Teacher Corps projects will of necessity develop these qualities.

Second, communicate! The best way to assure success is to have an open system. It is amazing how failure to communicate what may appear to be the most inconsequential things can result in major problems. In the UH/HISD project, interns were on the verge of revolt because no one had clearly communicated the meaning of an Incomplete on their transcripts.

Above all, be sensitive to the fact that a Teacher Corps project is a human affair. Consciously provide for all participants to be involved in decisions which affect their roles. And you will find that a sensitive ear, a trusting and confident stance, the exercise of much patience, tolerance, and understanding, and a generous sprinkling of "warm fuzzies" will be useful as well.

OPERATION OF THE INSTRUCTIONAL SYSTEM

Wilford A. Weber

Introduction

Because of institutional commitments which have been bolstered by encouragement from the Texas Education Agency and Teacher Corps Washington, each of the Network projects has attempted to design and operate competency based instructional systems for the training of interns. Ample evidence to this effect is found throughout project proposals. Indeed, in most cases this is a major program objective and in no case is it not a stated objective. Typical are statements such as those which follow:

> *To design, develop, and implement that body of knowledge, skills, course content, and degree program organization needed to establish a competency based Master's Degree Program in Bilingual Education at the Elementary level.* (Texas A&I University at Laredo–Crystal City Independent School District, 1971, page 16.)
>
> *Texas Southern University will develop a model teacher education program which is competency based and which will contain the following elements: field oriented curricula for the portal schools; behaviorally oriented instruction; systems management design and systems analysis; research based curricula; individulized instruction; multiple entry and exit points; multicultural philosophy and curriculum development; inservice training for regular teachers and administrators in the portal schools and collaboration with other institutions in terms of materials and other resources for development of the competency based program.* (Texas Southern University–Houston Independent School District, 1971, page 124.)
>
> *To establish and operate a teacher education program for the training of interns which is: competency based; field-centered; modularized; collaborative and systemic in design and management; well-conceptualized (in terms of the teacher's role as: facilitator of pupil growth, rational decision-maker, change agent, designer of curriculum and personalizer of instruction); and personalized (within the constraints of certification and degree requirements, program duration, and resource availability).* (University of Houston–Houston Independent School District, 1972, pages 22-23.)
>
> *The School of Education at the University of Texas at El Paso is committed to develop a two-year competency based master's*

degree program (K-6; modular form) for non-education students possessing a bachelor's degree to enable them to become effective teachers of disadvantaged Mexican-American children. (The University of Texas at El Paso, 1972, page 3.)

Prairie View A&M University will develop competency based education programs at the institutional level in general education, specialization, and teacher education. Competency based is defined as modularized instruction featuring behavioral objectives, learning experiences, and performance criteria with field orientation. This competency based program can serve as a model for small developing institutions in the United States. (Prairie View A&M University, 1974, page 27.)

Considerable progress was made in Cycle VII in identifying course objectives and in stating them in fairly observable terms. A diagram of these objectives was developed by which overlap in course objectives was identified. From this basis, Cycle IX is ready to start Phase IV in the CBTE Change Model diagram and to reconsider, revise, and redistribute objectives across subject matter areas. Specifically, statements of objectives will be clarified and converted into criterion referenced tests of skills, for use as pre- and post-tests. Existing self-instructional modules in reading, math, science, media, and bilingual education will be refined and new modules developed in classroom management and perhaps social studies. The resulting system of objectives, tests, and modules should be invaluable in converting the standard departmental program to CBTE in the near future. (The University of Texas at Austin–Austin Independent School District, 1974, page 37.)

As a concept, the notion of a competency based instructional system has been variously defined. Therefore, it is not at all surprising to find that each project has developed its own operational variations on the competency based theme. Philosophical considerations, program priorities, and institutional constraints have shaped project perceptions regarding the operational characteristics which have been incorporated in the program's instructional system. Thus it is that these operational characteristics differ from project to project. This is as it should be. The purpose of this chapter is to briefly describe one set of these characteristics as they have been operationalized in one program—the University of Houston–Houston Independent School District Eighth Cycle Teacher Corps Project. This is not to make any claims concerning the quality of that program but rather to provide a context—an instructional system whole—within which the parts might be examined.

Specifically, this chapter very briefly describes the University of Houston–Houston Independent School District Eighth Cycle Teacher Corps Program and examines each of the following aspects of the instructional system as they have been operationalized in that program: (1) competency based instruction; (2) conceptualized role description; (3) specified competencies; (4) explicit assessment criteria and procedures; (5) achievement orientation; (6) entrance requirements; (7) criterion-referenced assessment and grading; (8) field-centered instruction; (9) modularized instruction; (10) individualized and personalized instruction; (11) support personnel roles; and (12) evaluation procedures.

The Program

The program is typical of most Teacher Corps projects in that is is a two-year graduate internship for persons holding baccalaureate degrees in field other than education. The program leads to a Master of Education degree and provisional elementary school certification. The internship consists of a school component, a community component, and a university component. In the school component, the intern teaches a minimum of twenty hours per week in one of two inner-city elementary schools which serve primarily Black and Chicano children. In the community component, the intern works in some type of community service activity a minimum of ten hours per week. And in the university component, the intern satisfied the academic requirements for the degree and certification–a total of forty-five credit hours.

The program also includes the training of program staff, team leaders, university faculty, inservice teachers and administrators, and community persons. However, as in most Teacher Corps projects, the major emphasis is on the training of interns. Therefore, it is this instructional system which is discussed here. Specifically, the discussion will focus on the program's efforts to achieve the following major objective:

> To collaboratively establish and operate a teacher education program for the training of interns which results in their: demonstrating competency with regard to curriculum design and the personalization of instruction using diagnostic-prescriptive strategies; receiving Provisional Certification; and receiving Masters Degrees..

Competency Based Instruction

As noted earlier, program objectives called for the establishment and operation of an instructional system for the training of interns which was competency based. While there are numerous and often complex definitions of that term, in this program the term has been

used to denote only three related notions: (1) the competencies to be demonstrated by the intern are specified and made public; (2) the criteria to be used in assessing the competency of the intern are made explicit and public; and (3) the intern is held accountable for the demonstration—not the acquisition—of those competencies and for meeting those criteria. Each of these notions is discussed more fully in sections which follow. However, it seems important here to emphasize that aspect which has been central to the operation of the instructional system: interns are held accountable for demonstrating—at predetermined criterion levels—those competencies which program designers believe are requisite to effective teaching. The intern is expected to demonstrate many of those competencies in classrooms while teaching children. But the intern is not accountable for completing a particular set of learning activities. That is, the interns are encouraged to engage in those experiences they feel will help them acquire the specified competencies but are not required to engage in any particular experiences. This is an important operating principle and one which distinguishes competency based instruction from more traditional approaches.

Conceptualized Role Description

The previous section noted that the program has placed importance on the specification of those competencies which interns are required to demonstrate. In addition, the program has held that these competencies ". . . should be generated from the widest possible range of sources, but each must be screened through a philosophical base which has been built on a conceptualized model of the teacher's role as a facilitator of growth in children; unless proposed competencies are compatible with the conceptualized role of the teacher they should not be included in the program" (University of Houston—Houston Independent School District, 1972, pages 277-278).

As noted earlier in this chapter, one of the program objectives called for the instructional system to be "well-conceptualized (in terms of the teacher's role as: facilitator of pupil growth, rational decision-maker, change agent, designer of curriculum, and personalizer of instruction)" (University of Houston—Houston Independent School District, 1972, pages 22-23). It was this perception of the teacher's role which provided the conceptual base from which competencies have been derived. Conceptualization of the model and specification of the competencies was the first—and the most difficult—task undertaken by the program development team. For many members of the team, it was a new experience to make public their assumptions concerning the role of the teacher and to be explicit concerning their expectations of the teacher education student. Thus, this proved to be

both a difficult and rather lengthy process. However, the result was a set of competencies which had been generated from a well-conceptualized—and unanimously agreed upon—model of the teacher's role.

Specified Competencies

That competencies were derived from a conceptualized model was discussed in the previous section. Here, the nature of those competencies is briefly described. The program held that the competencies were to be statements describing those understandings, behaviors, and consequences which designers of the program believed a teacher must be able to demonstrate in order to effectively facilitate the intellectual, social, emotional, and physical growth of the learner. This thinking was based on the assumption that the effective teacher is one who: "knows about and understands those things which it is thought a teacher must know to be effective; is able to perform those behaviors which it is thought a teacher must perform to be effective; and is able to bring about outcomes in students which are thought to be desirable" (University of Houston—Houston Independent School District, 1972, page 189).

The following are examples of the types of statements which were generated:

> Diagnoses learner emotional, social, physical, and intellectual needs.
>
> Identifies and specifies instructional goals and objectives which are based on learner needs.
>
> Designs and implements instruction appropriate to specified goals and objectives.
>
> Designs and implements evaluation procedures which focus on learner achievement and instructional effectiveness.
>
> Uses organizational and management skills to facilitate and maintain social, emotional, physical, and intellectual growth of learners.

Such competency statements are the building blocks of which the instructional system was built. That is, instructional units—instructional modules—have been designed to assist interns in the acquisition and demonstration of each of the competencies specified. For example, the last of the competencies given above provided the basis for an instructional module on classroom management. A later section provides a more complete description of the program's concept of an instructional module and it is sufficient here to note that those competencies which are specified as program expectations are made public in the instructional modules which constitute the instructional system. That is, a

statement in each of the instructional modules fully describes the competency for which the module has been designed and in this way makes the competency public.

Further clarity as to the nature of the competency and as to the expectations of the program is provided by statements which specify instructional objectives for each module. For example, the classroom management module cited above contains eight instructional objectives. The following are examples of instructional objectives from that module; the first is a cognitive objective, the second a performance objective, and the last a consequence objective:

> The intern will describe teacher facilitation managerial behaviors; that is, behaviors which are assumed to have the potential of: (1) achieving group unity and cooperation, (2) establishing group standards and coordinating work procedures, (3) using problem solving to improve classroom conditions, and (4) changing unacceptable established patterns of group behavior to those which are more productive.
>
> The intern will perform teacher facilitation managerial behaviors are assumed to have the potential of: (1) achieving group unity and cooperation, (2) establishing group standards and coordinating work procedures, (3) using problem solving to improve classroom conditions, and (4) changing unacceptable established patterns of group behavior to those which are more productive.
>
> The intern will: (1) achieve group unity and cooperation, (2) establish group standards and coordinate work procedures, (3) use problem solving to improve classroom conditions, and (4) change unacceptable established patterns of group behavior to those which are more productive in a classroom setting.

Explicit Assessment Criteria and Procedures

The assessment of competency is among the most difficult of tasks in a competency based instructional system. The program has attempted to make explicit and public both its assessment criteria and its assessment procedures. It has done so by describing these in the instructional modules. Again using the classroom management module, the following example is presented:

> In a classroom setting selected by the intern and approved by his Assist and Assess Team, the intern will: (1) achieve group unity and cooperation, (2) establish group standards and coordinate work procedures, (3) use problem solving to improve classroom conditions, (4) change unacceptable established patterns of group behavior to patterns deemed acceptable, (5) maintain or restore

group morale, (6) handle group conflict, and (7) minimize classroom management problems in ways judged effective and appropriate by his Assist and Assess Team in accordance with criteria established by the intern's Corpsmember Team. The Assist and Assess Team will use "pupil behavior data" in making its judgment. That is, the intern is accountable for the results he or she achieves with his or her pupils.

That specific criteria are not included in this description of the assessment procedures should be noted. In this particular case—as in many others—the intern is expected to demonstrate his ability to bring about certain pupil behaviors in a classroom setting. Inasmuch as such situations are quite different from classroom to classroom, the designer of this module elected not to specify a particular set of criteria. Instead, recognizing that this was a case in which assessment would be situation specific, he chose to have the assessment team generate the criteria on the basis of its understanding of the classroom situation—the group, the intern, and so forth. Notice, however, that the team would be expected to specify these criteria in advance and to make them known to the intern. The intent is that expectations should be made just as clear as possible so that everyone "knows the rules of the game."

Achievement Orientation

As noted earlier, competency based instructional systems place emphasis on the demonstration of competency. A logical extension of this notion suggests that the instructional system should be achievement-based, not time-based. That is, time should be variable while achievement criteria remain constant. In short, the program should not hold the student accountable for meeting requirements within a specified time. In so far as possible, students should be free to time restrictions; they should be able to move through the program as quickly—or as slowly—as they are willing and are able.

While the program is somewhat flexible as to time parameters, it must also be recognized that it is a two-year program. This does impose time constraints. In addition, resource realities—instructor availability and the accessibility to instructional materials, for example—restrict this sort of flexibility. The program does attempt to maximize self-pacing within the two-year period. Such efforts are enhanced in two ways: (1) instructors work on an accessibility basis; that is, they are assigned to the Teacher Corps project for some percentage of their time throughout the entire two-year period; they are available to work with interns at any time they are needed; thus, instructors are not assigned to teach a particular course within a specific time-frame but rather are assigned to be accessible to interns who need help with any

of a particular set of instructional modules; instructors are responsible for a particular set of modules but are not assigned to conduct instruction within a particular time; and (2) instructional materials are made readily available to interns; a resource center has been established in one of the schools in which interns teach; multiple copies of these materials are housed in the center and interns are free to use these materials and do so on a very frequent basis. The key to self-pacing is viewed as resource accessibility. The program has attempted to maximize accessibility. This—coupled with the elimination of course time parameters—make the program as achievement-based as constraints allow.

Entrance Requirements

Because competency based instructional systems stress the demonstration of competency, such systems place far greater emphasis on exit requirements than on entrance requirements. This is based on the assumption that the abilities of the student after he or she has experienced instruction are far more important than the abilities of the student prior to instruction. Elsewhere in this document, admission and entrance procedures have been discussed in great detail. As shown, Teacher Corps projects typically admit interns who do not meet the usual admission requirements. This is likewise true in the University of Houston—Houston Independent School District program. Experience suggests that an overwhelming percentage of these interns do demonstrate the competencies specified and do meet the program's academic requirements; that is, interns who could not have met traditional entrance requirements were able to meet the program's exit requirements. Competency based instructional systems provide students with that opportunity.

Criterion-Referenced Assessment and Grading

Earlier this chapter described how the program specifies assessment criteria and procedures; the purpose of this section is to briefly describe the program's provisions for assessment and grading. In a competency based instructional system, assessment procedures are criterion-referenced. That is, procedures are established which allow for a determination of whether or not the student has achieved an instructional objective at that criterion level specified. Norm-referenced assessment procedures—those used in traditional programs—place the performance of the student on a relative scale which compares his or her performance with that of others. In assessment procedures that are criterion-referenced, then, the student is required to demonstrate mastery with regard to each competency specified. Thus, decision regarding the student either has demonstrated the competency at the specified criterion level or he has not yet demonstrated the competency.

The University of Houston–Houston Independent School District program uses criterion-referenced assessment. However, this creates problems because the university grading system is norm-referenced. Instructors are expected to use letter grades of A, B, C, D, and F; the university does not have a "pass-not yet" grading system. In an attempt to find a grading system which would reflect the type of assessment used, program designers went to an "A-Incomplete" system. Interns who demonstrate mastery are credited with a letter grade of "A." Those interns who have not yet demonstrated mastery are given an "Incomplete" until such time as they demonstrate the competency. This is a bastardized compromise which is far from being totally satisfactory. It is likely that the best reporting system is one in which students post-register for credit after having demonstrated their competency; transcripts would contain descriptions of those competencies demonstrated. While the program is making some progress in this direction, it is clear that a totally adequate solution to the problem remains in the future.

Field-Centered Instruction

As noted earlier, competency based instructional systems require the teacher education student to demonstrate many competencies in classroom settings with children. The Teacher Corps internship provides the perfect opportunity for such activities. However, most Teacher Corps projects are field-centered, not field-based. A field-centered instructional system is one in which instruction is given both in the field and on the campus. In a field-based program, all instruction is offered in the field–in the public schools. The latter is the case in the Houston program.

All formal instruction is given in a staff development center located in one of the site schools. All instructional materials are located in the center. Interns are never required to visit the university campus. This is considered to be a major strength of the program because it makes the instructional system readily accessible to the intern. Accessibility–as noted earlier–is viewed as being a necessary prerequisite to program effectiveness.

Modularized Instruction

The instructional system utilizes the instructional module which it defines as a set of learning activities intended to facilitate the intern's acquistion and demonstration of a particular competency or set of competencies. The program's instructional modules consist of: (1) a rationale which describes the nature and importance of the competency and places the module and the competency within the context of the total program; (2) the instructional objectives which the intern

is expected to demonstrate; (3) a statement describing prerequisite competencies the intern should have demonstrated prior to attempting the module; (4) pre-assessment procedures—usually of a diagnostic nature—which provide the intern with an opportunity to demonstrate mastery of the objectives and to "test out" the module; (5) learning alternatives which are the various instructional options available to the intern and each of which is designed to contribute to his or her acquisition of the objectives; (6) post-assessment procedures which permit the intern to demonstrate achievement of the objectives; and (7) remedial procedures to be undertaken by the intern who is unable to demonstrate mastery of the objectives on the post-assessment.

Instructional modules are used for several reasons: (1) they are a most convenient way to "package" instruction in a way which is consistent with the tenets of competency based instruction—specified competencies, explicit criteria, and so forth; (2) they enhance the possibility of self-paced instruction, alternative routes of instruction, and personalized instruction; (3) they facilitate program modification and revision; and (4) they make the management of the instructional system somewhat easier.

Individualized and Personalized Instruction

While the program is committed to individualize and personalize instruction, it is clear that the constraints of program duration, degree and certification requirements, and resource availability often place rather severe limitations on the ability to do so. In spite of this, program efforts with regard to individualization have been extensive. For example, all assessment procedures are negotiable and can be tailor-made to the intern and his or her particular situation. And, while most instructional objectives are required, some are negotiable. Most importantly, however, is the fact that all learning activities are optional. The intern is entirely free to select those which he feels will be most helpful or to design his own learning experiences. Very often instructional activities are designed in response to intern expressions of need. And as noted previously, instructors are "on call" to respond to intern requests for assistance. All of these attempts are enhanced by team leaders who capably perform counseling and supervision roles on a daily basis.

Personalization of instruction is somewhat less extensive. To a very large degree, the program has been able to respond to intern requests for instruction and resources which go beyond that which is required to satisfy degree and certification requirements. The major form such efforts have taken are workshops conducted by consultants. These have proved very satisfactory. In addition, arrangements have

been made for interns to take academic work which enables them to acquire teaching certificates in addition to the provisional elementary school certificate for which the program was designed. They have included early childhood education and physical education certification.

While serious attempts have been made to personalize the intern's instructional program, in reality, numerous constraints have not made this completely possible. However, it should be noted that the instructional system has been viewed as preparing individuals to assume professional responsibilities. Consequently, it is not possible—nor is it appropriate or responsible—to permit interns to "do their own thing" with regard to their academic work.

Support Personnel Roles

The roles and responsibilities of Teacher Corps program personnel have been discussed in detail elsewhere in this document. However, it does seem appropriate here to briefly describe the roles several key persons play with regard to the instructional system.

Without a doubt, the most important person in the successful operation of the instructional system is the team leader. The team leader is an employee of the school district, a master teacher, and the person most directly responsible for the professional growth of the intern for they supervise the internship experience.

Unlike most projects in which five or six interns are assigned to one team leader, the University of Houston—Houston Independent School District program has twelve to sixteen interns assigned to three team leaders. The Team leaders share equal responsibility for the supervision of the intern team. This arrangement is viewed as much more effective than the usual one because it enables the team leaders to capitalize on each other's strengths and to overcome individual shortcomings. In addition, it means that the team leader does not function alone but has ample opportunity for peer interaction and support.

As noted above, team leaders are master teachers who work directly with interns. It is important to note that their most important role is as clinical supervisors. Briefly, they observe interns to determine the extent to which they are demonstrating the competencies specified, provide interns with feedback intended to improve their performances, give instructional assistance as needed, and certify intern competence in those cases where the assessment procedures call for them to make such decisions. Instructors often find that—given proper instructional assistance—team leaders are those persons most effective in determining intern competence in as much as they work with interns on a daily basis. In effect, team leaders often serve as instructors of record as they certify intern competency or recommend such certification.

The efforts of the team leaders are facilitated by the staff development specialist—the team leaders' team leader. The staff development specialist manages the staff development center and is very active in training team leaders and in coordinating their activities. Thus, the specialist is heavily involved in the training of interns and of inservice teachers as well. Experience suggests that the specialist—an employee of the school district—is very important to the effective operation of the instructional system—for he or she is in close contact with the day to day operation of the system.

The program development specialist—as implied by the title—is the university person responsible for all aspects of the instructional system. He or she directs program design and development efforts, monitors program effectiveness, and coordinates all instructional activities, personnel, and materials. In short, the program development specialist is responsible for the design and operation of the instructional system.

Evaluation Procedures

Central to program effectiveness is program evaluation of both a formative and summative nature. No attempt can be made here to describe the program evaluation procedures in detail. It is sufficient to stress but two points: (1) effective—and useful—evaluation begins with the specification of program objectives; and (2) the purpose of evaluation is to provide information which facilitates the making of programmatic decisions.

If one is to evaluate the effectiveness of the instructional system it is necessary to specify in advance—and in as much detail as possible—the program objectives related to the instructional system. The proposal for the University of Houston—Houston Independent School District program contains fourteen objectives specifically related to the instructional system for training interns. This enhances evaluation efforts.

Elsewhere in this document, program management strategies have been fully discussed. The importance of valid information in the making of data-based decisions was emphasized. Evaluation of the instructional system is dependent upon such procedures. Two aspects of this process deserve emphasis here: (1) the instructional system must establish procedures which allow for the continuous monitoring of intern progress and instructional effectiveness; interns, team leaders, and staff members must be encouraged to provide feedback on a regular basis and mechanisms must be established to accept and utilize that feedback; and (2) the instructional system must establish procedures which permit direct and immediate response to feedback concerning the system; that is, the system must be—and must be

perceived as being—regenerative, capable of change; those who make an effort to provide feedback will not continue to do so if they do not see that the system is responsive.

Summary

This chapter has described several characteristics of one program's instructional system for training interns. Other programs in the Network are in many ways similar and in other ways quite different. These differences should be viewed as variations on a theme, differences which should be encouraged.

As one examines the instructional systems of Teacher Corps projects it seems appropriate to be mindful of several points which effect what one finds: (1) different projects have different notions concerning the characteristics of their instructional systems due to philosophical differences and institutional constraints; thus, systems differ and this is as it should be; (2) few fully operating competency based instructional systems exist; thus, project efforts are largely experimental because tested models do not exist; (3) project are largely developmental efforts; thus, problems—and mistakes—are to be expected even in the best of circumstances; (4) Teacher Corps funding patterns are most appropriate for traditional instructional systems and are not particulary well-suited for innovative systems; (5) Teacher Corps funding supports program operation but does not adequately support either program development or program evaluation; and (6) funding lead time is usually painfully short with the result that development activities are very often rushed; this sometimes later causes program operation problems.

In spite of the problems listed above, those who examine Teacher Corps projects will find teacher education programs which are among the most innovative to be found. In most cases, they are good examples of competency based instructional systems.

THE INSTRUCTIONAL SYSTEM AND ASSESSMENT

Sumpter L. Brooks
and
Wilford A. Weber

Introduction

Teacher Corps programs are instructional systems. Most are competency based instructional systems. As with other types of instructional systems, the major purpose of assessment in a Teacher Corps program is to provide information on which program managers can base operational decisions. But as competency based instructional systems they call for assessment procedures which provide data which are generally less inferential and more predictive than those data usually available in more traditional approaches. That is, typically competency based instructional systems make rather rigorous demands of the assessment procedures; they require the collection of more valid data than are generally obtained in more conventional instructional systems (Weber, 1974, p. 279).

The intent of this chapter is to discuss the purpose and nature of assessment in Teacher Corps programs which are competency based instructional systems. Therefore, this chapter examines issues which are related to assessment within the instructional context of the program. The purpose here is not to disucss program evaluation but rather to focus attention on assessment only as it related to the instructional system. More specifically, this chapter describes the factors which are considered in making decisions regarding the types of data to be collected, examines the types of decisions for which assessment procedures are to provide data, describes assessment criteria and procedures which are appropriate to each of those types of decisions, and provides some examples of each of those types of assessment criteria and procedures.

Considerations in Selecting Assessment Procedures

Several factors must be considered in the selection of assessment criteria and procedures: (1) the purpose for which the data obtained will be used; (2) the predictive validity of the data obtained; and (3) the feasibility of applying those criteria and utilizing those procedures in an instructional system context.

Purposes of Assessment. Much has been written concerning the purposes of assessment instructional systems. Four major purposes are discussed here: (1) the monitoring of student progress; (2) the determination of student achievement; (3) the evaluation of instructional

effectiveness; and (4) the validation of specified competencies. The assertion here is that in a competency based instructional system assessment procedures are expected to provide information that enhances the quality of decisions program managers make regarding students progress, student achievement, instructional effectiveness, and competency validity. In short, in a competency based instructional system it is important that the assessment procedures provide valid data which are maximually useful in making decisions relevant to each of these four areas.

Monitoring Student Progress. Competency based instructional systems require formative data regarding student progress. The monitoring of student progress—constant, ongoing formative assessment—provides information which is useful for both student and instructor decisions. Such data help students make better decisions in selecting objectives and learning experiences from among those alternatives and options which the program has provided; and these same data enable instructors to make better decisions regarding those instructional strategies and materials which might best be used to facilitate student achievement of specific objectives. Thus, assessment procedures of a formative nature are used to monitor student progress; that is, they are utilized to indicate how students are progressing with respect to explicitly stated instructional objectives related to specific competencies. Further, they are used to provide both the student and the instructor with feedback about the status of the student relevant to those objectives. In short, formative assessment procedures provide data about how well students are progressing in the program.

Determining Student Achievement. Competency based instructional systems also require the utilization of summative assessment procedures which provide data on the extent to which the student has demonstrated mastery in those competencies that are specified as program expectations. That is, the instructional system requires summative data about student achievement. These data are useful in making decisions such as awarding academic credit, degrees, and certification. Thus, this type of assessment procedure provides information which indicates whether or not the student has met certain program requirements. While formative assessment procedures provide data about how sutdents are becoming competent, summative assessment procedures provide data about whether or not students have become competent.

Evaluating Instructional System Effectiveness. A competency based instructional system is judged in terms of its intended purpose.

Questions of effectiveness are concerned with the extent to which students who are graduated from the program have in fact acquired and demonstrated those competencies the program has set as desired expectations. This means that the program must continuously assess the degree to which its students are demonstrating and have demonstrated those specified competencies. Such continuous evaluation and analysis provides program managers with information on both instructional effectiveness and efficiency. These data are used by program managers to make informed judgements about instructional system refinement and modification. Such decisions are best based on formative data that provide feedback on the appropriateness of instructional objectives, the adequacy of instructional processes, and the competence of program graduates. Only assessment procedures which provide such feedback can promote the development and operation of a fully open and regenerative instructional system. Thus, it is clear that the quality of information obtained and available largely determines the ability of program managers to make decisions intended to optimize both the effectiveness and the economy of the instructional system. And in addition to formative data regarding instructional effectiveness, programs also gather summative data in this regard. Such information is used primarily for periodic and final reports which document program accomplishments. Usually the same data are used for both formative and summative purposes.

Validating Specified Competencies. The validation of the competencies specified in a competency based instructional system is also essential to program effectiveness. Thus, Teacher Corps programs must be committed to empirically testing the validity of those competencies specified as programmatic expectations. While it should be noted that it is most difficult to establish relationships between specific teacher competencies and pupil outcomes, it is necessary for programs to perceive those competencies selected as expected student outcomes to be untested assumptions to be treated as testable hypotheses. That is, each program must hold itself accountable—within the limits of its resources—for determining the validity of each specified competency by presenting evidence that supports or rejects those hypotheses. If the purpose of the instructional system is to prepare teachers who are competent as defined by the program, then the program must be able to provide data which indicate that those competencies specified are indeed related to desired pupil outcomes. In short, it must determine the extent to which the instructional system is facilitating the acquisition and demonstration of those teacher competencies which are related to pupil change.

The kinds of data-based decisions that must be made in competency based instructional systems differ in their perceived complexity and importance. The monitoring of student progress, the determination of student achievement, the evaluation of instructional effectiveness, and the validation of specified competencies require the application of assessment criteria and procedures which supply somewhat different types of information for each of these four kinds of programmatic decisions. Thus, such criteria and procedures are seen as providing information which must meet different types of data needs. Additionally, decisions which are seen as crucial are viewed as requiring information which allows great confidence—highly predictive, low inference data. For less important decisions, more inferential and less predictive data may be considered useful. This issue—concern about predictive validity—is discussed more fully in the next section of this chapter.

Predictive Validity Considerations

That the quality of decisions that program managers are able to make is directly related to the validity of the data they use in making those decisions is clear. As noted earlier, decisions made on the basis of data which have a high degree of predictive validity are likely to inspire great confidence. Conversely, decisions that are made on the basis of highly inferential data are more likely to be considered suspect. However, it is also true that program managers are prone to require data with a high degree of validity when making crucial decisions while being far less demanding of the data when making decisions which are far less important. In short, the more important the decision to be made, the more predictively valid the data must be. This notion is explored more fully later in this chapter as attention is given to the types of criteria and procedures which are most likely to yield the most predictively valid data.

Those concerned with issues relating to predictive validity find themselves faced with numerous measurement problems which effect the confidence that one can place in the data obtained. Our present level of psychometric sophistication does not permit the accurate measure of human behavior of a complex nature in complex situations, except at extremely great expense. Further, it is painfully obvious that those assessment procedures that are most likely to provide the most valid data are the most difficult and the most expensive to obtain. Generally, one finds that such expense may be justified in research and development settings while it is not justified in instructional settings. Thus, competency based instructional systems must be committed to the establishment of assessment procedures that will provide program managers access to the best available data given both "state of the art" and resource realities. That is, programs should attempt to obtain

the most valid data possible at a price that is reasonable given the perceived importance of the decision to be made.

Feasibility Considerations

In making decisions relevant to program design and operational procedures, program managers are faced with time and resource realities which limit what is possible. Thus a program's assessment procedures are a reflection of those realities as they are perceived by program managers. Concerns about feasibility nearly always impose themselves on decisions regarding assessment in a competency based instructional system. The crucial question becomes one of determining whether the cost of gathering certain types of data can be justified by the extent to which these data reduce the risk taken by decisions makers. Program managers must make this determination on the basis of those priorities they have established. Only they can determine how much the program can and will invest to get what kinds of data for a given decision. And in considering these problems, program managers must keep in mind that those data which are likely to be most predictively valid are both the most difficult and most expensive to obtain.

The position which has been taken here is that in making decisions regarding the types of assessment procedures and criteria to use in a competency based instructional system, consdieration must be given to three factors: (1) the purposes of the instructional system and the perceived importance of the data-based decisions to be made; (2) the kinds of assessment criteria and procedures that will yield data at a level of predictive validity with which program managers can be satisfied; and (3) the "cost" of the data to be collected through the application of both criteria and procedures selected. The task is one of obtaining the "best" information possible at a "cost" the program can afford, given both the purpose of the program and the perceptions held about the importance of the decisions to be made on the basis of that information. Thus it is that this task is a program-specified process.

Assessment Criteria

Thus far this chapter has established that Teacher Corps programs are instructional systems which have as their primary training purpose the preparation of competent teachers, has identified four of the more crucial of the types of decisions for which assessment is expected to provide information in competency based instructional systems, and has described some considerations which should be noted in selecting assessment criteria and procedures. An examination of those criteria which are viewed as appropriate to the satisfaction of instructional system data needs follows.

In general, it seem appropriate to suggest that many of the procedures which have been advocated by proponents of competency based instruction can be traced to developments which have come from the teacher effectiveness research efforts of the past several decades. These have included improved assessment models, measurement tools, and statistical procedures. Indeed, in describing assessment procedures and criteria which are thought to be useful in assessing teacher competency in teacher education programs, is has been suggested that most

> . . . *appear to build on the classic model of teacher effectiveness research proposed by Mitzel (1960). Using an input-process-output systems model, Mitzel provides a very useful description of three types of criteria that might be used in studying teacher effectiveness: (1) presage variables, which include teacher personality attributes and teacher knowledge; (2) process variables, which include teacher and student classroom interaction behaviors; and (3) product variables, which include the effects of teaching in terms of changes in student behavior. His model suggests that there are teacher (and student) personality attributes and knowledge–presage factors–which influence the nature of teacher-pupil classroom behaviors–process factors–and that these behaviors influence the pupil learning outcomes of that interaction–product factors.* (Weber, 1974, p. 283)

More typically, in competency based instructional systems these three criteria have been called knowledge, performance, and consequence criteria respectively.

Thus, in competency based instructional systems knowledge, performance, and consequence criteria are applied to assess the competence of the teacher education student. The type of criterion selected in a particular situation is dependent upon several factors: (1) the nature of the competency–and of the instructional objectives–specified; (2) the perceived importance of the decision or decisions to be made using the information obtained through the application of that criterion; and (3) the stance of the program designers and managers regarding the nature of the data they will accept as evidence that the student has demonstrated that competency.

Clearly, knowledge criteria are most appropriately applied in those instances where the objective calls for the student to demonstrate his or her cognitive ability and the purpose of assessment is to obtain information about what he or she knows. Performance criteria are best used in those cases where the objective requires that the student display certain behaviors and the intent of the assessment procedures is to gain data regarding the ability of the student to behave as prescribed. Consequence criteria are most appropriately applied in those situations in

which the objective calls for the student to bring about specific pupil outcomes and the assessment is designed to provide data concerning the student's ability to bring about those pupil outcomes.

Three very brief examples of the types of instructional objectives, assessment criteria, and assessment procedures which might be used in instances where the program design calls for the student to demonstrate competency with regard to "classroom management" are presented below. The first example uses knowledge criteria, the second example uses performance criteria, and the third uses consequence criteria. While it is clear that the objectives, criteria, and procedures presented here differ—as would the data obtained through the application of these criteria and procedures—it is the intent in each case to use those data obtained to infer student competency with regard to classroom management. While each example is one through which program managers obtain evidence on which to base a decision regarding the student's level of achievement, the nature of the evidence each would yield is quite different from example to example. That is, each provides a different set of data from which the same sort of decision is to be made.

Example One: **Knowledge.**

Objective: The student will describe those classroom management behaviors which have the potential to facilitate and maintain productive individual pupil and classroom group behaviors.

Criterion: Knowledge criterion; information which confirms the student's ability to accurately describe a particular set of classroom management behaviors.

Procedures: Pencil-and-paper test administered, scored, and judged by the instructor; test requires that the student describe certain classroom management behaviors.

Example Two: **Performance.**

Objective: The student will perform those classroom management behaviors which have the potential to facilitate and maintain productive individual pupil and classroom group behavior.

Criterion: Performance criterion; information which confirms the student's ability to display a particular set of classroom management behaviors in an acceptable manner.

Procedures: Student attempts to display specified behaviors in a variety of teaching situations; he or she is videotaped and is observed by the instructor who judges

the adequacy of his or her performance using an observational checklist; videotape is used to confirm observations.

Example Three: **Consequence.**

Objective: The student will facilitate and maintain productive individual pupil and classroom group behavior.

Criterion: Consequence criterion; information which confirms the student's ability to facilitate and maintain productive individual pupil and classroom group behavior over an extended period of time.

Procedures: Student attempts to facilitate and maintain productive individual pupil and classroom group behavior as a result of having taught that class for three months during internship; prior to this period, student, cooperating teacher, and instructor specify pupil behavior the student can reasonably be expected to bring about with that class; cooperating teacher and instructor make periodic observations of pupils to determine the extent to which prespecified pupil behavior expectations are being met; student has demonstrated competency when they judge that pupils are behaving in expected manner.

An examination of these simple examples and of the literature confirms the view that various teacher educators hold conflicting views regarding the selection and utilization of assessment criteria and procedures. A decreasing number hold that the utilization of knowledge criteria alone yield data which are sufficiently valid as teacher competency predictors. Others disagree with that view and have concluded that performance criteria must be applied if useful data are to be obtained. Still others—educators who are more demanding—find fault with both of those positions and assert that only the utilization of consequence criteria supplies data which are sufficiently valid as predictors of teacher competency. Still others prefer to use combinations: knowledge, performance, and consequence criteria; knowledge and performance criteria; or performance and consequence criteria; or performance and consequence criteria. Turner (1972) and Weber (1974) have presented particularly interesting descriptions of this controversy. Both have suggested that ones position in largely a matter of personal or program conviction. They point out that such convictions are dependent upon the factors to which program managers attend and the weight they give to each.

Turner has expanded knowledge, performance, and consequence into six levels of criteria: (1) knowledge criteria (criterion level six); (2) performance criteria (criterion levels five, four, and three); and (3)

consequence criteria (criterion levels two and one). He makes the following recommendation:

> *Criterion level six is concerned with the effects of a training program on improvements in teacher knowledges and understandings. Criterion levels five and four are concerned with the effects of teacher training on improvement in pedagogic skills under laboratory or simplified training conditions. Criterion level three addresses itself to the effects of training on the teacher's behavior under actual classroom conditions. The concept of pupil change as a criterion of teacher effectiveness is introduced at criterion levels two and one. Criterion level two is concerned with changes in pupil behavior that can be effected in a relatively short time period (one or two weeks) and under actual classroom conditions. Criterion level one is concerned with the long-range effects of teacher behavior on changes in pupil achievement and well-being* (Turner, 1972, p. 7).

While these recommendations appear to have great merit, the controversy still rages. The nature of that controversy has been described by Weber who has offered the following opinion:

> *Although residual pupil gain is* the *ultimate criterion of teacher competency, such a position—rigidly taken—does not give adequate consideration to the problems created by a real world. At the least, this includes concerns about program purposes, predictive validity, and feasibility. The answer is not to be found in the use of pupil data as* the *criterion, but in* the *use of pupil data when, in the judgment of program decision-makers, it is valid and feasible to do so. It is clear that decisions about validity and feasibility are matters of judgment and conflicting views may result is also clear. In deciding whether or not to use consequence criteria, teacher educators should be encouraged, and indeed should be expected, to exercise good judgment. However, they should not be expected to arrive at the same conclusions* (Weber, 1974, pp. 295-296).

That there are differences of opinion regarding the appropriateness of using certain assessment criteria and procedures as opposed to other criteria and procedures for a particular purpose is quite apparent. It is equally apparent, however, that such differences of opinion are quite legitimate because questions of feasibility are addressed quite differently by different teacher educators. While the authors do not claim to possess any special wisdom that makes their views the most valid in this regard, the figure on the next page does present their biases with regard to the types of criteria—knowledge, performance, and consequence—which might be appropriately applied

relevant to the four assessment purposes noted earlier—the monitoring of student progress, the determination of student achievement, the evaluation of instructional effectiveness, and the validation of specified competencies.

Purpose of Assessment	Criteria		
	Knowledge	Performance	Consequence
Monitoring of Student Progress	X	X	
Determination of Student Achievement	X	X	X
Evaluation of Instructional Effectiveness	X	X	X
Validation of Specified Competencies			X

Figure 1. Criteria appropriate to purposes.

The position represented here is that the effective monitoring of student progress is best achieved through the application of knowledge and performance criteria. The utilization of consequence criteria, while yielding particularly valid data, is viewed here as being far too expensive a process for the collection of formative data to be used for this type of feedback. It is recognized that the collection of "soft" consequence data is useful inasmuch as it is not prohibitively expensive. That is, the student or a trained observer might observe the children being taught by the student and note—rather subjectively—"how the kids are doing." Such soft data might be fed back to students to give them a better idea of the effect that their teaching was having on the children with which they are working.

Clearly, the data demands of student progress monitoring are not rigorous. The kinds of day-to-day decisions made using these data do not warrant great expenditure of time and money. For example, self-scoring pencil-and-paper tests and uncomplicated observational checklists would provide data appropriate for such formative purposes.

The determination of student achievement generally requires more rigorous criteria and procedures than does the monitoring of student progress. That is, data to be used for summative purposes are expected to be "harder" than those obtained for formative purposes. The recommendation here is that knowledge, performance, and consequence criteria be utilized in determining student achievement. This reflects a bias that stipulates that the student ought to be held accountable for a demonstration of knowledge competencies, performance competencies, and consequence competencies. It should be noted that this is not a universally shared position. Some teacher educators hold students accountable for the demonstration of performance and consequence competencies; others hold students accountable for only consequence competencies.

Because of the nature of the decisions that are to be made with regard to the student's achievement, the procedures through which knowledge, performance, and consequence data are obtained are generally quite rigorous and formal. These procedures are intended to collect "hard" data. Knowledge data are often obtained through the utilization of formal, pencil-and-paper tests. Performance data are generally obtained through the utilization of highly structured observational systems. Consequence data are obtained through the utilization of rather rigorous procedures which yield pupil data. Admittedly, consequence data collected for the purpose of determining the level of the student's achievement are often not as rigorous as they might be. Again, considerations regarding the time and money required to collect these data are brought into play. In short, decisions as to whether or not students have achieved mastery with regard to the competency specified, whether or not they have "passed," whether or not they should be graduated, and whether or not they should be certified, are important decisions requiring valid data. Therefore, procedures tend to be quite formal. Program designers and managers strive to obtain the most valid data they can afford.

Inasmuch as the assumption here is that the student should be held accountable for the demonstration of knowledge, performance, and consequence competencies, it follows that the evaluation of instructional effectiveness would require knowledge, performance, and consequence data. That is, such data would be used to determine the extent to which the instructional system was effective—and efficient—in facilitating the acquisition and demonstration of those competencies specified as student outcomes.

Generally, the criteria and procedures used would be the same as those used in collecting data relevant to the determination of student achievement. That is, very often the same data used to determine a student's level of achievement is used to determine the

extent to which the instructional system was effective in promoting such achievement. Two differences are worthy of noting in that regard: (1) it is likely that procedures used to determine instructional effectiveness would permit the examination of pre-post differences in the student's level of achievement with regard to a particular competency of set of competencies; and (2) in addition to knowledge, performance, and consequence data, the evaluation of instructional effectiveness often involves procedures which provide student perceptual data regarding attitudes toward various elements of the instructional system and perceptions regarding its effectiveness, efficiency, relevance, and the like. Indeed, it is quite common to find program designers and managers asking students to comment on the effectiveness of a particular instructional module. Thus, the evaluation of instructional effectiveness has both a formative dimension and a summative dimension. As noted earlier, formative data tend to be "soft" while summative data tend to be "hard." Thus, both "soft" and "hard" data are useful in those processes used to monitor and determine instructional system effectiveness.

The validation of those competencies specified as student outcomes involves a very demanding set of procedures requiring the application of consequence criteria. Because those competencies specified as student outcomes must be valid—they must be teacher knowledge, performance, or consequence variables which facilitate desirable pupil outcomes—relationships between the competency and pupil growth must be established empirically. This requires the collection of "hard" pupil growth data. The relationships between pupil product data—usually residual pupil gain scores—and a competency or set of competencies specified as facilitating of a particular pupil product is tested.

The application of consequence criteria and procedures of the nature which will yield sufficiently valid and reliable data useful for these purposes is both expensive and time consuming. However, if those competencies specified as student outcomes are to be validated, such rigorous procedures are necessary. This is not to assert that utilization of such data must be perceived as a temporary stage in a process which requires more valid data. That is, the utilization of soft data does not provide an adequate test of competencies which have been specified as untested, unvalidated assumptions.

Examples of Assessment Procedures

This section builds on the suggestions presented above regarding the utilization of knowledge, performance, and consequence criteria in obtaining data relevant to monitoring student progress, determining

student achievement, evaluating program effectiveness, and validating specified competencies. The examples given reflect the biases of the authors with regard to the importance of decisions to be made utilizing the data obtained, the validity of the data thus obtained, the feasibility of collecting those data, and the type of criterion indicated by the competencies specified. Those holding different views would no doubt come to different conclusions and present somewhat different examples.

Example One—Monitoring Student Progress: **Knowledge Criterion.**

Objective: The student will identify and describe the types of learning centers appropriate for elementary school children.

Criterion: Knowledge criterion; information which indicates the student's level of ability with regard to the identification and description of the types of learning centers which are judged to be appropriate for elementary school children.

Procedures: Formative assessment; having studied various types of learning centers and having come to some conclusions as to those which are appropriate for elementary school children, the student discusses his or her views with the instructor; during their discussion, the instructor provides the student with feedback concerning the adequacy of his or her views; the process is one in which both the instructor and the student become informed regarding the student's level of ability relevant to the objective.

Comment: The objective calls for the student to demonstrate his or her knowledge; thus, the application of knowledge criteria. The decision to be made concerns the student's level of progress with regard to that objective; thus, the utilization of formative assessment procedures is suggested. The decision is not viewed as requiring rigorous data; therefore, rather informal procedures—yielding somewhat subjective information—are suggested here. Clearly, there are other procedures which would be equally appropriate. The important thing to remember here is that the need is for "inexpensive" data which will allow both the student with regard to an objective calling for the student's demonstration of knowledge.

Example Two—Monitoring Student Progress: **Performance Criterion.**

Objective: The student will establish and operate at least three distinct learning centers within a classroom for a period of at least three weeks.

Criterion: Performance criterion; information which reveals the student's level of ability with regard to the establishment and operation of a classroom which contains at least three distinct learning centers for a period of at least three weeks.

Procedures: Formative assessment; the student designs a schematic model of a classroom which incorporates at least three distinct learning centers; he or she describes the purpose and operation of each center; the student presents his or her design and description to his or her instructor; the instructor discusses the design and description with the student; with the instructor's approval the student implements the design with the intent of operating the centers for at least three weeks; at the end of the first day of operation, the student and the instructor discuss the day's events giving particular attention to the learning centers; the student and the instructor invest much of their time in devising ways to solve problems which they have identified; the process is one in which both the student and the instructor become informed regarding the student's level of ability relevant to the objective and plan on the basis of that information.

Comment: In this example, the objective requires that the student demonstrate his or her ability to perform a specific set of behaviors; therefore, the utilization of a performance criterion. The intent of assessment here is to provide information which indicates the extent to which the student is progressing with regard to the objective; the decision is not viewed as a crucial one requiring particularly valid data. Consequently, informal, rather subjective, formative procedures are recommended. The view taken here is that direct observation by the instructor coupled with pre-teaching and post-teaching conferences is an effective procedure. Admittedly, different but effective procedures might be just as appropriate. The point is that whatever procedures are used they must provide feedback relevant to the student's progress and must do so rather inexpensively.

Example Three—Monitoring Student Progress: **Consequence Criterion.**

Objective: The student will establish and operate at least three distinct learning centers within a classroom for a period of at least three weeks; pupils working in those centers will

perceive this to be an enjoyable and productive learning experience.

Criterion: Consequence criterion; information which indicates that the pupils working in the learning centers established and operated by the student perceive this is an enjoyable and productive learning experience.

Procedure: Formative assessment; having operated three distinct learning centers within a classroom for a period of one week, the student administers a rating scale to his or her pupils; the rating scale is designed by the student and is intended to provide pupils with an opportunity to express their feelings about working in the centers during that week; in addition, the questionnaire would also provide pupils with an opportunity to make recommendations for improving the centers; the student would analyze the responses obtained from the pupils and would modify his or her operation as is suggested by that analysis.

Comment: The objective calls for the student to demonstrate his or her effectiveness in establishing and operating learning centers; the perceptions of his or her pupils are to be used as the indicator of effectiveness. Therefore, it is suggested here that a consequence criterion is most appropriately used. Recognizing that the collection of consequence data of high predictive validity is very costly and that the decision to be made here is of lower-level importance, formative assessment procedures are recommended. Equally attractive alternative procedures might be used so long as they are designed to obtain pupil perceptual data useful to the student as he or she examines his or her effectiveness and attempts to make improvements. Earlier in this chapter it was suggested that only "soft" consequence data might be used in monitoring student progress because "hard" consequence data are too expensive. This example is built from that position. Others may view the use of soft data as inappropriate because they lack rigor; it is viewed here as being quite useful.

Example Four—Determining Student Achievement: **Knowledge Criterion.**

Objective: The student will identify and describe the types of learning centers appropriate for elementary school children.

Criterion: Knowledge criterion; information which permits a determination of whether or not the student has demonstrated mastery relevant to the identification and description of learning centers which are judged to be appropriate for elementary school children.

Procedure: Summative assessment; when the student feels he or she is prepared to successfully demonstrate mastery relevant to the objective, he or she requests the administration of appropriate assessment procedures. In this case, these consist of a pencil-and-paper test which is a reliable and valid measure of the student's ability to identify and describe those learning centers judged by the instructor to be appropriate for elementary school children. The test is scored by the instructor who determines whether or not the student has demonstrated mastery. That decision is communicated to the student.

Comment: The objective calls for the student's demonstration of mastery with regard to certain knowledge; therefore, a knowledge criterion is used. Unlike Example One, in this case the nature of the decision requires the utilization of summative data; thus, assessment procedures are used to obtain data which are both highly reliable and valid. Where applicable, standardized tests are quite useful in this regard. At the very least, it would be expected that instructor-made tests would not be used unless shown to be reliable and valid. Assessment procedures other than those suggested here would be equally acceptable so long as they provide data on which to make decisions regarding the student's mastery of the objective.

Example Five—Determining Student Achievement: **Performance Criterion.**

Objective: The student will establish and operate at least three distinct learning centers within a classroom for a period of at least three weeks.

Criterion: Performance criterion; information which allows a determination of whether or not the student has demonstrated mastery with regard to the establishment and operation of at least three distinct learning centers for a period of at least three weeks.

Procedures: Summative assessment; at some time after operating the centers for three weeks, when student feels that he or she is ready to demonstrate mastery relevant to

the objective, he or she requests that the instructor determine whether or not his or her efforts have been satisfactory and are acceptable. During the operation of the centers, the instructor has used an observational checklist to record and describe the performance of the student and the operation of the centers. When informed by the student that he or she is ready for a final assessment in this regard, the instructor arranges for an additional observation or observation to collect further data of this sort. The instructor analyzes the data thus obtained, compares it to a criteria profile which has been generated to make public that performance which is acceptable, and determines whether or nor the student has demonstrated mastery relevant to the objective. The student is informed of the decision.

Comment: The objective in this example requires that the student behave in a specified manner; therefore, performance criteria are utilized. At issue is the question of mastery; thus, summative data are required. An observational checklist—one which can be used to obtain objective, reliable, and valid data—is recommended here because it is an attractive means of obtaining "hard" data in a situation which does not lend itself to easy assessment. The view here is that systematic observation used in a manner that provides data which are moderately valid and which can be viewed in relation to predetermined criteria is acceptable. Other procedures may be viewed as yielding equally valid data but questions of feasibility very often diminish their usefulness. In short, systematic observation remains the best procedure in situations like those in this example.

Example Six—Determining Student Achievement: **Consequence Criterion.**

Objective: The student will establish and operate at least three distinct learning centers within a classroom for a period of at least three weeks with the result that pupils working in those centers will perceive this to be an enjoyable and productive learning experience.

Criterion: Consequence criterion; information concerning the extent to which pupils working in the learning centers established and operated by the student perceive this is an enjoyable and productive learning experience; this

information is used to determine the effectiveness of the student relevant to the objective.

Procedures: Summative assessment; after no less than three weeks but when the student indicates that he or she is ready, a standardized questionnaire which has been shown to be reliable and valid is used by the instructor to collect pupil perception data which indicates the feelings of those pupils who have worked in the learning centers established and operated by the student. The questionnaire would yield data regarding pupil perceptions regarding enjoyment and productivity relevant to their experience in the centers. The instructor would analyze those data apply predetermined mastery criteria, and determine whether or not the student had demonstrated mastery with regard to the objective. The results would be communicated to the student.

Comment: It is the view here that the nature of the objective requires the utilization of consequence criteria—pupil data; and the nature of the decision to be made using those data requires the utilization of summative assessment procedures which yield reliable and valid data. Where applicable, standardized tests are best in serving this need. Obviously, there are serious limits as to those that are available. Teacher educators are faced with having to assess in areas where standardized instruments are not available. Program managers must therefore commit themselves to designing instruments which are reliable and valid measures appropriate to their specific data needs. Thus, the development of "good" instruments must be a rather high program priority.

Example Seven—Evaluation of Instructional Effectiveness.

Purpose: To monitor instructional system processes and to determine the extent to which the system is effective and efficient in achieving its goals.

Criteria: Knowledge, performance, and consequence criteria as well as additional criteria which are applicable in providing information about the system but which are not directly related to student objectives and outcomes; that is, criteria appropriate to system objectives, not student objectives. Information which allows program managers to make decisions regarding the effectiveness and efficiency of the instructional system; these include issues such as the appropriateness of student objectives, the adequacy of

instructional processes, and the competency of program graduates.

Procedures: Formative assessment; with regard to those decisions which relate directly to concerns involving student objectives and outcomes, data collection procedures like those recommended in Examples One through Six are viewed as appropriate. That is, program managers use knowledge, performance, and consequence criteria and establish assessment procedures which allow for the collection of data about student progress and achievement. These data are used to make decisions concerning the system's impact on the student. Simply put, if the students are able to demonstrate the competencies specified and are able to do so within a time frame which is considered reasonable, it is inferred that the instructional system has been successfully assisting the student; that is, it has been effective. As noted above, it is very common for program designers to utilize other criteria in order to collect data from which they draw inferences regarding the system's effectiveness. Most common is the use of rating scales to ascertain student perceptions relevant to specific instructional modules. For example, students are asked to use rating scales to indicate their feelings about the relevancy of specified competencies, the appropriateness of instructional objectives, the adequacy of learning alternatives, the quality of assessment procedures, and the effectiveness of instructors. The data thus obtained is analyzed and utilized in making decision regarding modification of the instructional system.

Comment: As noted much earlier in this chapter, the evaluation of instructional effectiveness is generally viewed as requiring formative assessment procedures. Clearly, the more valid the data yielded by those procedures, the more likely it is that good decisions about system refinement will result. It was also noted earlier that the same data which result from the application of formative assessment procedures can be used and often is used for summative purposes. This is very common when such information is needed for progress or final reports. The report is largely a compilation of formative data presented in summative form.

Example Eight—Validation of Specified Competencies: **Consequence Criterion.**

Purpose: To empirically validate those competencies specified as student outcomes; that is, to establish an empirical relationship between a particular competency or set of competencies and a desirable pupil outcome or set of outcomes.

Criterion: Consequence criterion; predictively valid data which allow program managers to determine the extent to which those competencies specified as student outcomes are related to desirable pupil outcomes; that is, information which permits informed judgments regarding the degree to which a specific competency is an indicator of teacher effectiveness.

Procedures: Summative; the procedures in this instance are very similar to those advocated in Example Six. However, in this case the decision to be made is seen as a highly critical one and the issue is largely a research issue. Thus, the need is for low inference, high predictive validity data. The utilization of consequence criteria and the application of rigorous research methodology can meet this need.

Comment: The position taken here is that each and every competency specified as a student outcome in a competency based instructional system must be treated as an assumption which must be tested in terms of its purported relationship to pupil outcomes deemed desirable. The utilization of pupil outcome data requires the application of consequence data. Further, the view here is the validation of those competencies is an undertaking of major importance and, consequently, requires very rigorous data—data which satisfy the data requirements generally accepted by educational researchers. This view is not intended to deny program designers the right to specify competencies which have not been validated nor is it intended to deny program designers the right to use "soft" data in attempting to get better information about those competencies. It is only to assert that program managers should treat those competencies as untested assumptions until rigorous, empirically derived data show them to be valid assumptions.

This section has provided a few brief examples which are intended to illustrate the types of assessment criteria and procedures viewed here as appropriate to the four major types of decision required in a competency based instructional system. Clearly, the examples given are neither inclusive nor exhaustive. And although the examples do

reflect the biases of the authors, they are largely representative of the views held by many who are involved in the design and operation of competency based instructional systems.

Summary

This chapter has examined the purpose and nature of assessment in competency based instructional systems. It has described four of the more crucial types of decisions for which assessment is expected to provide data in a competency based instructional system and, in so doing, has made a case for their importance. Further, it has described some considerations—purpose, validity, and feasibility—which should be taken into account during the selection of assessment criteria and procedures. Further, there was an examination of those criteria—knowledge, performance, and consequence—which are viewed as appropriate to the satisfaction of instructional system data needs which call for some measure of student competence. The last section of the chapter presented examples of various types of assessment criterion procedures which might be appropriately used in competency based instructional systems.

This chapter has emphasized that the selection of assessment criteria and procedures is a highly judgmental process which is greatly influenced by the program designer/manager's perception of reality. Thus, this chapter has not attempted to provide definitive solutions. It has attempted to define the problems which might be considered and to offer suggestions—biased recommendations—as to how those problems might best be addressed. It remains for the reader to make his own judgments in this regard.

References

Mitzel, Harold E. "Teacher Effectiveness," *Encyclopedia of Educational Research, Third Edition.* Edited by Chester W. Harris. New York: Macmillan, 1960.

Turner, Richard L. "Levels of Criteria," *The Power of Competency-Based Teacher Education.* Edited by Benjamin Rosner. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1972, Chapter 1, pages 3-23.

Weber, Wilford A. "Using Pupil Data to Assess Teacher Competencies," *Exploring Competency Based Education.* Edited by W. Robert Houston. Berkeley: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1974, Chapter 19, pages 279-299.

TEACHER CORPS PROJECT LISTING

Project	No. of Cycles
Edgewood Independent School District—San Antonio	9th
Prairie View A&M University—Prairie View	1st, 2nd, 3rd, 5th, 9th
Texas A&I at Kingsville—Kingsville	1st, 4th
Texas A&I at Laredo—Laredo	7th, 10th
Texas Christian University—Forth Worth	4th, 10th
Texas Southern University—Houston	5th, 7th
University of Houston—Houston	1st, 2nd, 6th, 8th
University of Texas at Austin—Austin	5th, 7th, 9th
University of Texas at El Paso—El Paso	6th, 8th, 10th